

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1915.

THE ΟΔΤΝΗΦΑΤΑ ΦΑΡΜΑΚΑ OF *ILIAD* V. 900, AND THEIR BEARING ON THE PREHISTORIC CULTURE OF OLD SERVIA.

THE passage about Paeon's treatment of the wound of Ares in *Iliad* V. 899-904 has been neglected or misunderstood by the majority of commentators, and no one, so far as I know, has pointed out its significance for pre-Homeric culture in that part of the Balkan area in which archaeological research has shown a connection with and influence on the culture of North Greece. I refer to that part known as Old Servia, extending from Naissus, the modern Nish, at present the temporary capital of Servia, and below Skopi, modern Uskub, into northern Macedonia.

I will first take up the generally misunderstood Homeric passage.

The verses are as follows:

Ὡς φάτο καὶ Παιήων' ἀνώγειν ἰήσασθαι.
τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Παιήων ὀδυνήφατα φάρμακα πάσσω
ἠκέσας, οὐ μὲν γάρ τι καταθνητὸς ἐτέτυκτο,
ὥς δ' ὅτ' ὀπὸς γάλα λευκὸν ἐπειγόμενος συνέπηξεν
ὑγρὸν ἔόν, μάλα δ' ὦκα περιτρέφεται κυκώωντι
ὥς ἄρα καρπαλίμως ἰήσατο θούρον Ἄρηα.

'Thus spake he, and bade Paeon heal. And Paeon, putting the pain-allaying herbs on Ares' wound, healed him, for Ares was immortal. Like as when fig-juice by its quick action curdles the white milk which is liquid, but curdles quickly at the stirring, so Paeon healed fierce Ares.'

I cite typical comments:

Crusius.—'Das Tertium Comparationis in diesem Gleichnisse ist die Schnelle.'

Mistriotis.—ἡ παραβολὴ κεῖται ἐν τῇ ταχύτητι.

Leaf.—'The point of the simile lies in the speed of the process.' He adds: 'The idea evidently is that Paion miraculously turned the flowing blood to sound and solid flesh.'

But it is in the *Odyssey* and not in the *Iliad* that we find magic and miraculous healing. In *Odyssey* XIX. 455 sqq. it is narrated that the uncles of Odysseus bound up his wound, got from the wild-boar's tusk, and stayed the flow of blood by an incantation.

δῆσαν ἐπισταμένως ἐπαιοιδῆ δ' αἶμα κελαινὸν
ἔσχεθον.

This is the only passage in Homer in which such magical procedure occurs. In the *Iliad* the work of the physician is scientific. Cf. *Iliad* XI. 514 sq.:

ἰητρὸς γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων
ἰούς τ' ἐκτάμνει, ἐπὶ τ' ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσειν.

The physician's art in the *Iliad* is that of dressing wounds. So Machaon in *Iliad* IV. 218 sq. attends to Menelaus' wound:

αἶμ' ἐκμυζήσας ἐπ' ἄρ' ἥπια φάρμακα εἰδὼς
πάσσε, τὰ οὔ ποτε πατρὶ φίλα φρονέων πόρε Χείρων.

Cf. also *Iliad* XI. 829-835 and XVI. 28:

ἰητροὶ—πολυφάρμακοι—ἔλκε' ἀκεόμενοι.

Although in one case it is stated that the φάρμακα are to still the pain of the wound (*Iliad* IV. 191),

φάρμακ' ἃ κεν παύσῃσι μελαινάνων ὀδυνάων,

it is clear that in the saving of a soldier's life it is of far more importance to stay the flowing of the blood. And in the passage under discussion the simile of the curdling of milk with wild-fig juice, which has in general been criticized as irrelevant except in point of speed, could not be excelled in picturesque value for illustrating the effect of a styptic. The herbs are used to stop the flow of blood which caused such fear in those that beheld it. Cf. *Iliad* IV. 146-149.

I have in a previous paper argued for Paeon¹ as the Paeonian god of healing. Two φάρμακα used as styptics, κόνυζα (Athen. X. 67; see Diosc. Am. sub uoce) and the plant which we know as the peony have Paeonian connections.² The peony is by far the most significant. It is the styptic whose potency was earliest discovered and has the longest history, from prehistoric times down to the present day, as a magico-medical herb.

'Vetustissima inuentu Paeonia est nomenque auctoris retinet' writes the elder Pliny (N. H. XXV. 27), and in several places he discusses its magic and its medical properties. Its styptic power he notes in XXVI. 131, 'Sanguinis profluuia sistit herbae Paeonae semen rubrum—eadem et in radice uis,' and elsewhere.

Although the peony was introduced into England³ less than three hundred

¹ *Classical Review*, December, 1912, 249-251.

Peonie, etc., *Journ. Numismatique*, 1913, p. 258.

² See also J. Svonoros, *Numismatique de la*

³ Smith, J., *Dictionary of Economical Plants*.

and fifty years ago, it brought its penumbra of magic and folk-lore with it, and to-day 'a necklace of beads turned from the root of the peony is worn by West Sussex children to aid them in getting their teeth and to prevent convulsions.' (W. Black, *Folk Medicine*. See *Folk-Lore*, pass. sub voce). Among the recipes of the eighteenth-century herbalists, the peony plays a great role. The 'outlandish single peony' is recommended against insanity, convulsions, and all diseases thought to be caused by the moon. The roots and seeds are sometimes recommended as an 'electuary,' or potion, but the injunction is added: 'And last let them wear a necklace of single pyonie roots always about their necks.'¹ The time for giving the peony potion is specified as three days after the change and full of the moon. Nicholas Culpepper, in the *English Physician Enlarged* (1728), after remarking, 'Peony is an herb of the sun,' says that 'it is good against night-mares and melancholy.' Compare Pliny (loc. cit.), 'Haec medetur in quiete Faunorum ludibriis.' The meaning of the latter passage, by the way, appears to be misunderstood by Daremberg-Saglio (under *Faunus*).

I quote the English herbalists to show the astonishing persistence and solidarity there is in the folk-lore of a flower. In China, Japan, Persia, Arabia, Jerusalem, Greece, Rome, Central Europe, and England, the peony has been a magic herb of portentous power. In our country (America), devoid of folk-lore, it stands in harmless beauty in our gardens.

To go back to the Greeks. The rose came into North Greece from Persia and by the Balkan trade-routes. Midas of old had his rose-gardens in the North. There is Mount Rhodope, and to-day one of Bulgaria's largest sources of revenue comes from her wonderful stretches of rose-gardens and her attar of roses, with which she supplies all Europe.

The peony came early along the same route, through Persia, from a more remote East, where it is still held in honour, in China and Japan. In the country from which it got the name by which we know it, it was highly prized by the healers in whom that land abounded, the so-called *ρίζοτόμοι*, who gave Sophocles title and matter for a drama.² In the service of the Paeonian sun-god and moon-goddess, the beautiful and useful flower attained great fame for its efficacy, and gathered strange lore about it. The species that still grows in the Balkans and on the mountain tops of Greece is the *paeonia officinalis*, so-called from its healing properties, the red single peony.³

I will now discuss its homes, its folk-lore, and lastly its significance as a 'Kultur-pflanze' for the land which named it—i.e. Paeonia, now part of Old Serbia. The chief ancient authorities are—Theophrastus, *περὶ φυτῶν*; Dioscorides of Amazarba, *περὶ ὕλης ἱατρικῆς*; Pliny's *Natural History*; Aelian, *περὶ ζῴων*; the physicians Hippocrates and Galen; and the Orphic *Argonautica*. Dioscorides considers the peony entirely from a medical point of view.⁴ He gives the following list of names: *γλυκυσίδα* (= sweet pomegranate), *πεντόβορον* (from its five sepals), *ὀροβέλιον*, *ὀροβάξ*, *αἵμαγωγόν*, *παισαίδην*, *μηννογένειον*,

¹ See *Book of Simples*, Sampson Low, 1914.

² See Nauck, *Frag.*

³ Pickering, *Chronological Hist. of Plants*.

⁴ Dioscor. II.

μήμιον, πανθικέρατον, Ἰδαῖοι δάκτυλοι, ἀγλαοφωτῖς, θεοδόνιον, σελήνιον, σεληνόγονον, φθίσι, and (so-called by the Romans) κάστα.

As has already been noted by Roscher (see under *Monägöttin* in the *Lexikon*), many of these names bring the plant in direct connection with the moon. Among these is *ἀγλαοφωτῖς*. This name Pliny (*N. H.* XXIV. 100) prettily, but erroneously, explains as given to the plant because of the astonishing beauty of the colour of its blossom. I quote the passage: 'At in his ille [i.e. Democritus] post Pythagoram Magorum studiosissimus quanto portentosiora tradit, ut aglaophotim herbam, quae admiratione hominum propter eximium colorem accepit nomen. in marmoribus Arabiae nascentem Persico latere, qua de causa et marmoritis uocari; hac Magos uti cum uelint deos euocare.'

The references in this passage to the use of the flower for summoning the gods reveals the true meaning of the term as applied to the peony. It is the name of the beaming moon transferred to the plant that in the hands of a witch or wizard can bring her down from heaven. Compare Sosiphanes I. 2, p. 18:

μάγοις ἐπωδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη
Ψευδῆς (?) σελήνης αἰθέρος καταιβάτης.

The best commentary on the name *ἀγλαοφωτῖς* is found in Aelian I. 14. 27, where an interesting account of sympathetic magic in connection with the peony—here called *ἀγλαοφωτῖς* and *κυνόσπαστος*—is given. Aelian says that the plant in the day-time escapes notice amid its surroundings, and by no means catches the eye; but at night it shines out and gleams like a star, for it is like a flame of fire. So the *ῥιζοτόμοι* mark it at the root at night, as they would not be able to recognize its colour or its aspect by day. They do not dare dig the plant themselves, as the first to do this perished speedily. They bring to the spot a young hound who is starving after days of going without food, and fasten him to the peony stalk by a stout rope. Then they place savoury food just out of his reach. He, then, rushing for the food, drags the peony up by the roots. When the sun beholds the roots, the dog dies. He is buried in that self-same spot by the root-diggers, who perform a secret ritual over him, and honour him as having died in their stead. After this they dare to touch the mysterious plant, take it home and use it for many purposes, chief among which is the healing of the diseases of the moon (epilepsy) and the hardening of the aqueous part of the eyes. In this account the important points for magico-religious study are the sympathetic magic of the dragging (*σπάω*) by the dog to get the plant which cures *σπάσματα*; the name *κυνόσπαστος*; the offering of the dog, presumably to Hecate the moon-goddess, in whose garden the peony grows, and whose especial sacrificial animal is the dog; and the fact that the peony, like its mistress the moon, shines by night.

The moon-flower of Paeonia, which grows in Hecate's garden, leads us, then, to the worship of the moon, which was so famous and so infamous in

Nor
globe
pole,
The
wors
side
"Ape
fruits
lunar
tribe
wome
of so
Roma
previ
et Ap
name
learn

7
Iasior
and i
Farn
does
chiefly
there
gover
offspr
which

E
intere
prete
καὶ το
attrib
three
Iasius,
that i
which

B
who t
efficac
eyes o
of the

¹ Gill
P. 44.

North Greece. In the Daphnephoria at Delphi the sun was represented by a globe at the top of an olive-wood pole, with a moon globe halfway down the pole, the globes bound with fillets, saffron for the sun, and red for the moon. The pole is adorned with flowers. Among the Paeonians we find the sun worshipped in like manner by a disk at the end of a pole. We may set by his side in Paeonia, as elsewhere, the moon-goddess, and recognize her in the Ἄρτεμις βασίλεια worshipped by Paeonian women with offerings of earth's fruits. The fact that women worship Ἄρτεμις βασίλεια is significant for her lunar nature. 'The moon is Kourotrophos. She quickens the young of the tribe in their mother's womb; at one terrible hour, especially, is she a lion to women who have offended against her holiness. She also marks the seasons of sowing and ploughing, and in due time the ripening of the crops.'¹ The Roman inscriptions in Moesia and Pannonia, to which I have referred in previous papers, which are dedications to Diana Regina and to Dianae Reginae et Apolloni, suggest the same pair of heavenly deities, and the order of their names is significant. The moon-goddess is the older deity, and 'When men learn to calculate in larger units the sun appears.'²

This moon-goddess is that χρυσόθρονος Artemis ἄγνή of Homer who slays Iasion, the bridegroom of Demeter, who slays women with her gentle weapons and is called by Hera 'a lion to women.' Here, I think, is the answer to Farnell's statement about Artemis to the effect that it is obvious that Homer does not know her as a goddess of the moon. Homer knows Artemis chiefly as a lovely young goddess of the chase, a beautiful girl. But here and there in epithet and phrase the old nature goddess is seen. The moon-goddess governs the rhythm of woman's life, the goddess of fertility blesses her with offspring, and moon-goddess and earth-goddess are one in that great complex which the Greeks call Artemis.

Besides the moon-names of the peony the title *Idaeon dactyl* is of religious interest. The dactyls, spirits of the ἵδη or wood, as Wilamowitz has interpreted them, are ἀγαθοδαίμονες (Strabo X. 212) γόητες who superintend ἐπωδὰς καὶ τελετὰς καὶ μυστήρια (Diod. Sic. V. 44). The use of fire and iron is attributed to them. Their names as given by Pausanias are suggestive in three cases of Northern Greece. They are Heracles, *Paeonaeus*, *Epimedes*, *Iasius*, and *Idas*. It is doubtless only a coincidence, but an interesting one, that in Japan and China the spirits of the peony minister to the families to which they are attached.

Both Theophrastus and Pliny speak of the violence suffered by the one who tries to uproot the peony. This again refers to its anti-spasmodic efficacy. The wood-pecker has it under his especial charge and pecks out the eyes of those who dig it by day. The wood-pecker, δρυκολάπτης, is the bird of the god of the oak, who is sometimes a sun-god³ and worshipped by the

¹ Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*

³ A. B. Cook, *The European Sky-God* (C.R., 1904).

Paeonians under the name of *Dryalus* (Gerhard for Ἀῦαλος of Hesych.). By night the moon protects her flower.

We find Hecate wearing the oak in Sophocles' play *The Root-diggers*.

His invocation is—

“Ἥλιε δέσποτα καὶ πῦρ ἱερὸν τῆς ἐνοδίας Ἐκάτης ἔγχος,
τὸ δ' Ὀλύμπου πωλοῦσα φέρει καὶ γῆς ναίουσ' ἱερὰς τριόδους
στεφανωσαμένη δρυὶ καὶ πλεκταῖς ὤμων σπειραῖσι δρακόντων.

Here the Sun and Hecate the moon-goddess are the deities worshipped by the root-diggers. They are the Sun and Artemis βασιλεια of Paeonia, the land of healing.

Dardania is the neighbour of Paeonia. Strabo and Pliny give its site in several places. In Athenaeus, in a citation from Heraclides, they are mentioned casually as contiguous. 'It rained frogs in Dardania and Paeonia.' It is of significance that from the Dardanian language only two words have been preserved, and these are given by Dioscorides in his book on healing herbs as Dardanian names for plants which he mentions. The Dardans are thus cited as herbalists. In a previous paper I have given the evidence for the Paeonian herbs, salves, and potions. The Dacian names of herbs are frequently given by Dioscorides. This whole region was the land of the ῥιζοτόμοι.

The archaeological connections between North Greece and the Balkans have been emphasized by recent excavations. The trade-route between Servia and Troy is well established by geography and by actual remains. Homer knows of the Paeonians and of a settlement of Dardanians under Aeneas in Troy itself. The metal-work which is amply attested by Pliny, by ancient mines in Servia, and by Roman inscriptions and coins dealing with the Dardani have a reminiscence in Homer in the beautiful Thracian sword taken from the Paeonian Asteropaeus. Paeonia gave Greece the paean and the physician god. The Thessalian Asklepios and his sons are an off-shoot of the Balkan culture.¹

Messrs. Wace and Thompson in *Prehistoric Thessaly* show from the evidence of pottery that above Thessaly there is 'a line of cultures extending from Servia eastward and connecting with Troy, which are characterized by the use of incised pottery, weapons of Central European type, and probably also by an early knowledge of metal. . . . At present, the distribution of the early remains seems to confirm Homer in various ways. The most northern part of the Greek confederacy at Oloosron and the position of Priam's most western ally on the Axios mark the extreme limits of the early Thessalian and Thracian culture. The gap between seems common both to Homer and to prehistoric archaeology; at least, in the intervening region, only one early site has been found.'

From the Balkans came the Hyperborean Sun and Moon worship, which

¹ See also J. Svonoros, as on p. 66, n. 2.

coalesced with the Greek worship of Apollo and Artemis; there came the physician-god Paeon with his *ἐπαιδή*, which became the famous paeon, fraught with all high emotion; there came the Central European metallurgy and the cultivation and knowledge of healing herbs and fragrant roses; there came, too, the darker superstitions that clustered about Hecate, the moon-goddess, and the witch women who brought her down from heaven to help them in their black art. But Homer knows nothing of this baser sort. His Cheiron and his Circe are great conceptions, and the *ὀδυνήφατα φάρμακα* of Paeon in this passage marks the beginning of the physician's art in Europe.

NOTE.—I owe the first suggestion of the identity of the moon-goddess and *Ἄρτεμις βασίλεια* to Miss Jane Harrison (in a private letter).

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

VASSAR COLLEGE,
POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., U.S.A.

CORRIGENDA.

I. XPH AND ΔΕΙ.

* IN my paper on *Χρή* and *Δεῖ* in this journal for April, 1914 (VIII. 91-102), some errors call for correction, though they do not affect the argument at all.

Page 99, line 13 from foot: Thuk. v. 26, 4 has *δίοι* in the sense denied for Thukydides. But he is here *quoting* a prediction, *προφερόμενον ὑπὸ πολλῶν*.

Page 99, line 3 from foot: For 'should we accept' read 'should you accept us as.'

Page 101, table: A recount changes figures a little, as the footnote suggests that it might; under *Theast.* read *δεῖ* 34, *χρή* 13.

Page 102, line 10: For '10:16' read '10:18.'

T. D. GOODELL.

II.

In *C.R.* viii., p. 144, l. 7 from foot, the comment within square brackets should be deleted.

HESIODEA.

II.

(*Works and Days*, 172-181.)

In a note (C. Q. vii. p. 219) on the Geneva Papyrus, No. 94, I tried to show that of the four new lines (169 *a-d*) which that fragment adds to our text the last two formed an introduction to the Iron Age parallel to ll. 127, 143, 157. I may be mistaken, but I do not remember to have seen it remarked that in ll. 179-181 (rejected by Lehrs) we have the conventional ending to the Iron Age. As they stand these lines are obviously out of place: οὐδὲ πατὴρ παῖδεσσιν should follow l. 178 (or perhaps l. 177). It is clearly impossible to put these lines after 201, because the ending there is good and natural. Probably, therefore, they have been merely interpolated in their present position by an ancient editor, who thought to make the ending of the Iron Age conform to those of the other Ages (just as 169 *c-d* form a conventional beginning to the Iron Age). Thus l. 179 states the 'reward' or consolation which the Iron Race shall receive, just as ll. 122-6 give the reward of the Golden, and ll. 141-2 of the Silver Race. Similarly (l. 154) the men of the Brazen Race are 'rewarded' by perishing νόονυμοι, while the heroes (169 *c*: see my restoration *l. c.*) are blessed. In the same way ll. 180-1 foretell the *ending* of the Race, just as in ll. 121, 140, 156 we hear of the ends of the earlier races.

The lines 179-181 are therefore probably an early interpolation to give the Iron Age a conventional ending, just as 169 *c-d* give it a conventional beginning. Both passages are likely also to be by one hand.

(*Works and Days*, 191-2 κακῶν ῥεκτῆρα καὶ ὕβριν | ἀνέρα τιμήσουσι.)

None of the attempted explanations will stand, and Paley's emendations are too heroic as involving the omission of 192-4: a simple remedy seems to be to read ἀνέρες αἰνήσουσι at the beginning of l. 192.

(*Works and Days*, 361 and 363.)

Possibly 363 should be placed before 361. In 363 Hesiod says that by saving you avoid hunger: this would naturally be followed by the observation (361-2) 'for if you add only a little to a little and do this often, presently even that little will become great.' The order may have been changed to bring σμικρόν (361) next to σμικρόν in 360, without regard to the fact that in 360 a totally different matter is in question.

(*Theogony*, 886-900, 924-929.)

Chrysippus (*ap. Galen, de Plac. Hippocr. et Plat.* iii. 8, p. 318) gives a remarkable version of the birth of Hephaestus and of Athena which differs from the current text of the *Theogony*, and clearly belongs to another occasion than that which we possess. This version is printed by Rzach in his larger edition (1902), in the apparatus on 886 sqq., and to it—as Peppmüller has seen—must be prefixed a line like 928:

“Ἡρη δὲ ζαμένησε καὶ ἤρισε ᾧ παρακοίτη.

The object of this note is not to estimate the relation between the two Hesiodic versions, or between these versions together and the considerably different account in the *Hymn to Apollo*, 307 sqq., but simply to draw attention to an apparent dislocation of the text in the passage quoted by Chrysippus. As that citation stands, we have the following order of events: (1) The strife between Zeus and Hera. (2) Hera gives birth to Hephaestus. (3) The union of Zeus with Metis. (4) The swallowing of Metis by Zeus. (5) The birth of Athena.

It is immediately obvious that there is a lacuna between ll. 5 and 6 (as numbered by Rzach); and, secondly, the existing order of events is unnatural, no cause for the quarrel being given, and opposed to that of the current recension of the *Theogony* (924-9), where the quarrel is *caused* by the circumstances of birth of Athena and *followed* by that of Hephaestus. It would be possible to defend the existing order by maintaining either that the ‘strife’ (in the Chrysippus citation) was that related by Apollodorus iii. 6. 74 (Rzach, *Frag.* 162) after the Hesiodic *Melampodia*; or that in the version of Chrysippus Hera is supposed to have borne Hephaestus already, and that after the birth of Athena she bore Typhoeus (as in the *Hymn to Apollo*). A fatal objection to both these lines of defence is that Chrysippus says nothing about either of them—and that in a passage where he is detailing variants of the legend. We are therefore obliged to fall back upon the view that the text of Chrysippus has suffered dislocation. I propose the following order for the first seven lines wherein the trouble lies: the numeration is Rzach’s.

[αὐτοκασιγνήτην δ’ Ἡρην ποιήσατ’ ἄκοιτιν · ¹]	
αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ Ὀκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἠνκόμοιο	4
κούρη νόσφ’ Ἡρης παρελέξατο καλλιπαρήφ.	5
[“Ἡρη δὲ ζαμένησε καὶ ἤρισε ᾧ παρακοίτη · ²]	
ἐκ ταύτης [δ’] ἔριδος ἥ μὲν τέκε φαίδιμον υἱὸν	1
“Ἡφαιστον τέχνησιν ἄνευ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο	2
ἐκ πάντων παλάμῃσι κεκασμένον Οὐρανίωνων.	3
* * * *	
ἐξαπαφὼν Μῆτιν καίπερ πολυδῆνε’ ἐοῦσαν ·	6
συμμάρψας δ’ ὃ γε χερσὶν ἔην ἐγκάτθετο νηδύν.	7

¹ My supplement.

² Peppmüller’s supplement.

I have assumed that Hera was treated as the only legitimate wife of Zeus, and that the quarrel between the two was due to the unfaithfulness of Zeus with Metis, a mere paramour.

In the lacuna between ll. 3 and 6 we may suppose Zeus to have been warned by Earth and Heaven (cf. *Theog.*, 891 sqq.) of the danger threatening him from a future son of Metis.

It should be noticed that the birth of Hephaestus, though related before that of Athena, is anticipated merely, since Athena is begotten immediately before the quarrel.

(Rzach [1908], Fragment 96.)

Very serious trouble has been caused to the critics by the indication in the Berlin Papyrus (10560) of the beginning of a second book after l. 55 of this fragment, as also by the nature of its contents.¹ It may be worth while to put forward a suggestion, though in the nature of the case it can claim no more than probability.

It seems certain that the Catalogue of Suitors (noticed by the Townley scholiast on T. 240) was one of those developed episodes which occupied, seemingly, so large a place in the Hesiodic corpus. It originated, of course, from the normal mention of Helen in the *Catalogues of Women*. Hitherto, we had nothing to lead us to suppose that this episode was so considerable as to be divided into two books, but the papyrus leaves us no doubt upon that point: the second book cannot be that of the *Catalogues* or of the *Eoiae* (as I had once thought), and it is genuinely Hesiodic, as is proved by a citation: see Rzach (large edition), Frag. 216. Moreover the text of the papyrus shows an overlap between the two books.

The second book, then, must have carried the 'episode' of Helen and her suitors further, and I would suggest that this was done by means of a general narrative of the Trojan War. Will the contents of the second book, so far as they are preserved, admit this conjecture?

The contents of the better preserved part of the papyrus (ll. 56-104) may be summarized thus: (1) Zeus plans to make an end of demigods in order that there may be no more intermingling of the divine and human races. (2) Then a personage of prophetic character (surely Apollo) is introduced—we know not how. (3) Next follows an account of the affliction of men by unseasonable storms which destroy the fruits of the earth. (4) This occurs in spring-time, at the season when the 'Hairless-One'—the snake—breeds, and there follows a disquisition on the habits of the creature. Can all this be taken as leading up to the story of the Trojan War?

(1) The design of Zeus to make an end of the heroes or demigods finds an obvious parallel in the fragment from the beginning of the *Cypria* (Kinkel, Frag. 1), where, however, Zeus designed merely to relieve the over-burdened earth. In the *Cypria* and in the *Works and Days* (161 sqq.) we know that this design was accomplished by means of the Trojan (and Theban) War.

¹ Cf. Schubart-Wilamowitz, *Beri. Klassikertexte*, v. i., pp. 40 sqq.

(2) Owing to the mutilation of the papyrus we cannot ascertain how Apollo was connected with the design of Zeus 'to send to Hades full many heads of heroes fallen by the sword in strife' (ll. 80-81). Did he play the part of councillor—which (according to the analysis by Proclus) was played by Themis in the *Cypria*?

(3) The unseasonable storms which destroy the fruit of the ground need not weigh against the conjecture that the subject of Book II. is the Trojan War. The incident may well be a first attempt to destroy the heroes, checked, perhaps, by some objection on the part of Demeter, or by Zeus himself because the resultant famine (as in the *Hymn to Demeter*) deprived the gods of their sacrifices.

(4) Lastly, we have to account for the 'Hairless-One' and the disquisition on his habits, a passage which the German editors¹ totally misunderstand. In the usual Hesiodic manner we are told that the storms mentioned above befell in the spring season which is further defined as that in which 'the Hairless-One brings forth her young, three in every third year:' similarly in *W. and D.* 571 Hesiod, wishing to define a certain season (about the middle of May) writes: 'But when the House-Carrier climbs up the plants from the earth to escape the Pleiades.' What follows is therefore no more than a digression: the poet believes he has special knowledge of the habits of snakes, and finding an opportunity, inserts it here. Precisely the same thing happens in *W. and D.* 524 sqq., where there is a short digression on the 'Boneless One.'

In conclusion we may fairly claim that if (3) and (4) do not indicate that the Trojan War was the subject of Book II. of the Berlin Papyrus, they also do not in the least forbid it. On the other hand (2) contains a definite allusion to a coming war and, as a whole, surely presents the superhuman contrivance of that war; while (1)—on the analogy of the *Cypria* and the *Works and Days*—must be the prelude to one of the great wars of Greek legend, and, as following on the Catalogue of Suitors, to the Trojan War. It should be noticed that ll. 86 sqq. of the papyrus strongly recall the description of the month Lenaeon in *W. and D.* 504 sqq.—a fact which is important as indicating the use of that poem by the author of the papyrus fragment.

(Rzach [1908], Fragment 96, ll. 39-40.)

Very little is left of these two lines, and restoration is more than usually precarious; but the following may represent the general sense:

[Τυνδάρεος δὲ ἀναξ, ὅποσοι] κ[ίον] εἵνεκα κούρης,
[οὔτ' ἀπέπεμψεν ἐκὼν οὔτ' [αὐθ'] ἔλε [δῶρο]ν ἐκά[στων].

Some such sense is implied (1) by the use of πάντας in l. 91, (2) by ll. 97-9 which shows that Tyndareus took care to administer the oath before declaring his decision in favour of Menelaus. It is likely, then, that it was stated that he did not reject or accept any one suitor before asking them to take the oath.

¹ Berl. Klassikertexte, v. i., p. 44.

For ἔλε, which here is equivalent to 'received,' cf. *Hymn to Aphrodite*, 115, φίλης παρὰ μητρὸς ἐλούσα (of a nurse taking a child).

(*Papiri greci e latine*, No. 131.)

This fragment, which may belong to the same MS. as No. 130, seems certainly to belong to the Hesiodic *Catalogues*. In the original no thorough-going attempt was made to restore the passage which, indeed, is very baffling. The clue I have sought to follow in the restoration here given¹ is furnished by ll. 6-8, which seem to point definitely to Amphiaraus as the hero of the passage: in this case the mention of Alcmaon (l. 1) is merely incidental. In the lines preceding our l. 1, the author probably celebrated Eriphyle as wedded to Amphiaraus, and continued:

τῷ δ' ἔτεκ' ἐν μεγάροις] Ἀλκμάονα π[οιμέ]να λα[ὼν].
 τόν ῥ' ὑπὲρ Ἀργεῖ]ους Καδμηίδες ἔλκεσίπ[ε]πλοι,
 ὄμματά τ' εὐμεγέ]θές τε δέμας εἴσαντα ἰδοῦ[σαι],
 ἀμφιέποντα] ταφὰς πολυκηδέος Οἰδιπό[δαο],
 θαύμασαν . . .] . . . ενουκ . . . τινονπο[. . .]ρι[. . .] 5
 τῷ δέ ποτ' εἰς Θήβα]ς Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἀρη[ος
 ἔσπονθ' ὥς κε . . .] Πολυνείκει κῦδος [ἄρουντο.
 εὖ δέ καὶ εἰδότα περ] Ζηνὸς παρὰ θέσφατα [πάντα
 γαῖα χανούσά ἐ τηλοῦ] ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ βαθυδί[νεω
 κάππ[ι]ε σὺν θ' ἵππ[ο]ισι καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητ[οῖ]σι. 10

In ll. 1, 2 τῷ . . . τόν both refer to Amphiaraus (as does τῷ in l. 6). For ἀμφιέποντα (l. 4) cf. Ω. 804, and with the whole line compare the scholion on Ψ 679 (Rzach, *Frag.* 35): 'Ἡσίοδος δέ φησιν ἐν Θήβαις αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος, Ἀργεῖαν τὴν Ἀδράστου σὺν ἄλλοις ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν κηδείαν τοῦ Οἰδιπόδος. May not Amphiaraus have been one of the 'others'?

In l. 7 where I have written κῦδος, the original publication has *ἠταφο[ν]*: but if the letters are faint (no facsimile is available), the difficulty is not as great as might be supposed.

The restoration of l. 8 is weak, but may serve as a stop-gap, and the reference to the Alpheus in l. 9 is puzzling.

The remaining verses of the fragment have been restored as far as possible in the original publication, and I would only suggest that l. 17 should read—

βοῦσιν ἐπ' εἰλε]πόδεσσιν, ἐπεὶ να[.]να[. . .]

For the initial supplement cf. Z. 424: for ἐπεὶ the original publication has ἐλείν, which can scarcely be correct. I can make nothing of the remainder of the line.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

¹ The restorations of the endings of these ten lines are mostly those of the original edition.

NOTES ON THE *AGAMEMNON*.

32 sq. (Sidgwick): τὰ δεσποτῶν γὰρ εὖ πεσόντα θήσομαι,
τρίς ἔξ βαλούσης τῆσδέ μοι φρυκτωρίας.

θήσομαι is not 'I shall regard,' as has often been supposed, for the reason that the two lines thus become tautological: 'I shall account my master's fortune prosperous; this beacon is a stroke of good luck.' Verrall (quoting the Scholiast's οἰκειώσομαι, which does indeed strongly support his view) writes: "My lord's good fortune I shall score to my game," i.e. regard it as my own.' The weakness of this seems to be that it gets too much out of the termination of one verb;¹ something like οἰκειώσομαι is needed to support the emphasis.

τίθεμαι is the *vox propria* for making a move in the game πεσσοί. The allusion here is not merely to dicing, but to πεσσοί as a skilled variety of it—what is often called *κυβεία* (see Headlam's note). Briefly, it was a combination of luck and skill, analogous in this way to our games of cards. One threw the dice, and then showed one's skill by the manner in which the move so indicated was played. Our two lines thus become distinct in meaning. 'This beacon has thrown me a triple six; I will now put into effect my master's good luck'—to wit, by dancing (v. 31). He receives his cue from the Διὸς κύβοι and proceeds to 'move.' Whether the dance which the actor performed held any imitation or reminiscence of the moves in πεσσοί I cannot tell; but it is quite possible.²

312-314: τοιοῖδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι
ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι
νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.

This passage has suffered from too much ingenuity. Most scholars have recognized that the natural meaning of v. 314 is: "he" that ran first and "he" that ran last (alike) win.' The sense of this, again, would have been fairly clear had not editors been prone to press too hard the allusion to an Athenian λαμπαδηφορία and confused matters by discussing the system on which the prize was won in such a contest. Exact correspondence between the beacon-chain and a normal λαμπαδηφορία is, for two good reasons, out of the question. Firstly, the Queen's fire-series has no competitor. Secondly, the word τοιοῖδε, made emphatic by its place at the opening of the sentence,

¹ Verrall therefore naturally adds: 'Perhaps we should read *ἐμοί* (Keck) in v. 33.'

² There was an elaborate mimetic dance in the *Amphiaraios* of Sophocles (Athenaeus X. 454 F.).

and reinforced by *τοι*, shows with neatness and lucidity that although the beacon-chain can be compared to a team of torch-runners, it is to be so compared only in a special, peculiar, sense; a further detail in the phrasing points to this—the word *νόμοι*, which marks this *λαμπαδηφορία* as a novel institution. The arrangement of bonfires resembles a torch-race, because one fire takes up and passes on the message of another, like the athlete who carries the torch itself a further stage. There the resemblance ends—of course, for there is no competing team, and in consequence (whatever the precise implication of *νικᾶ*) no prize to be won.

It follows that vv. 312 sq. only describe the method of transmitting the message, and that *they are not meant to explain v. 314 itself*. This being clear, we are able to understand *νικᾶ κτέ*, 'the first runner and the last conquer alike.' They are said to 'win,' not because they beat anything else or one another, but because each fire, whatever its place in the chain, *bears a message of victory*, the news that Troy has fallen. The peculiar phrasing into which the Queen casts this simple idea is due, partly to a reminiscence (natural though illogical) of what happened in a competitive torch-bearing, partly to Clytemnestra's pre-occupation. I accept Verrall's theory of the plot, and suppose that these words are to be taken by the Elders in the sense just suggested, while the speaker herself means¹ that the victory over Agamemnon is gained by 'the first and last runner,' the only beacon, that is—the flare seen by the watchman.²

vv. 390-5: *κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον
τρίβῳ τε καὶ προσβολαῖς
μελαμπαγῆς πέλει
δικαιωθείς, ἐπεὶ
διώκει παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν,
πόλει πρόστριμμ' ἄφερτον ἐνθείς.*

πρόστριμμα in the last line, as Verrall and Headlam point out, looks back to the touchstone just mentioned. But it probably contains also a reference to the boy who chases the bird. He falls and bruises himself while the bird flies free (*ποτανόν*); the difference is that in Paris' case the *συντελὴς πόλις* (v. 532) is bruised also.

vv. 414 sq.: *πόθῳ δ' ὑπερποντίας
φάσμα δόξει δόμων ἀνάσσειν.*

Wecklein, followed by Verrall and Headlam, takes this to mean 'the lord of the house will seem no effectual lord, but a mere shadow,' because 'it is not naturally conceivable that the subject of *δόξει* should be other than *ὁ ποθῶν*' (Verrall). But surely the old and more beautiful explanation of the lines can be retained with hardly any loss if we regard *φάσμα* as accusative

¹ See Verrall's second edition, Appendix H.

² Though it would serve no particular purpose to give an account of all the explanations which have been offered, I ought to add that of course several commentators have noted that there is no

contest; and that Kennedy (I find) gives something like the view taken above, in his note 'This . . . means that the beacon of Ida, which looks down on the captured city, is on that account the winner. The victory is there.'

governed by *δόξει*: 'in his yearning for her who is overseas, he shall think that a phantom of her yet rules his house.'

437 sq.: *ὁ χρυσαμοιβὸς δ' Ἄρης σωμαίων
καὶ ταλαντοῦχος ἐν μάχῃ δορός κτέ.*

The second line is invariably (so far as I can find) translated as by Kennedy: 'and holds the scales in combat of the spear.' But *μάχῃ δορός*, 'the battle of the spear,' if we look at the phrase undazzled for a moment by the magnificence of its context, is surely miserable. *δορός* is the merest stop-gap; what else should a normal ancient battle be, rather than 'a fight of the spear'?¹

The genitive depends on *ταλαντοῦχος*.² We are led to this view by the clearer instance of the same construction in the preceding line: *χρυσ¹αμοιβ²ος σωμα³των, ταλαν¹του²χος δο³ρος*. Both genitives are corrective or limiting genitives. The precious dust which Ares gives is the dust of slain men; the beam of his balance is the levelled spear. In ancient infantry engagements the horizontal line of spears 'at the charge,' amid the confused shapes of everything else, must often have attracted the eye,³ and seems to have clung to the memory of the *Μαραθωνομάχης* Aeschylus.

vv. 696-8: *κελσάντων Σιμόεντος
ἀκτὰς ἐπ' ἀξιφύλλους
δι' ἔριν αἱματέεσσιν.*

Perhaps we should read 'Εριν in the last line. The interpretation ' (pursuing Helen to Troy) on account of a murderous quarrel ' is fairly good, but not striking. Paley (with others), however, sees a reference to Helen: 'the poet seems to call Helen herself Eris, a cause or subject of strife.' But δι' ἔριν is rather a feeble way of making the point. Reading 'Εριν, we obtain a reference to the Judgment of Paris caused by the goddess Eris and her apple, which was the first cause of Helen's elopement, the subject of the whole strophe.

1242-4: *τὴν μὲν Θυέστου δαῖτα παιδείων κρεῶν
ξυνῆκα καὶ πέφρικα, καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει
κλύοντ' ἀληθῶς οὐδὲν ἐξηκασμένα.*

The point of *ἐξηκασμένα* has, I think, been missed. Kennedy, for instance, translates: 'the tale told in its dread reality,' and Headlam:

Thyestes' banquet on his children's flesh
I understand and shudder,—nothing feigned,
No fable, terrible truth.

¹ In Soph. *Ant.* 674, for *σὺν μάχῃ δορός* Jebb accepts the conjecture of Reiske and Bothe, *συνμάχου δορός*, 'which has been generally received.'

² After writing the first draft of these notes I chanced to look up *ταλαντοῦχος* in L. and S. (7th ed.) and found a hint of the rendering. I suggest: '*δορός* belongs to *μάχῃ*, not to *τάλ*.'

³ In Uccello's picture, *The Battle of Sant' Egidio*, familiar to all who visit the National Gallery, the lances are extraordinarily conspicuous. The right half of the canvas, showing a lance 'in rest,' provides an excellent illustration of what Aeschylus means by *ταλαντοῦχος δορός*.

These renderings seem to rest on a false analogy. In *Septem* 444, ἤξειν κεραυνόν, οὐδὲν ἐξηκασμένον, the meaning is that Capaneus will be slain by a genuine thunderbolt, in contrast with the menacing *device* on his own shield.¹ To say that one thing is 'made like' another is often, no doubt, to condemn it as a counterfeit; but for *words* to be 'made like' their subject is the best that can happen to them. Therefore it is wrong in the present passage to take οὐδὲν ἐξ. as praise; for it ought, apparently, to imply 'vague,' 'inaccurate.' If no more precise meaning can be found for ἐξηκασμένα here, the passage becomes unintelligible. It can, however, mean 'wearing a mask.' Cp. *Ar. Knights*, 230 :

καὶ μὴ δέδιθ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξηκασμένος.
ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἤθελε
τῶν σκευοποιῶν εἰκάσαι.

See Neil's note. The actor who presents the 'Paphlagonian' will not wear a mask-portrait of Cleon, but will (so to say) wear his own face (*αὐτοπρόσωπος*). So here: the chorus-leader alludes to Cassandra's own promise (v. 1178 sq.):

καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων
ἔσται δεδορκῶς, νεογάμου νύμφης δίκην.

ἀληθῶς in v. 1244 means 'as you promised.'

vv. 1385-7: καὶ πεπτωκότε
τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι, τοῦ κατὰ χθονὸς
Αἰδου νεκρῶν σωτήρος εὐκταίαν χάριν.

νεκρῶν σωτήρος seems to have been often misunderstood, or rather the precise *feeling* of the passage has been missed. Of course Clytaemnestra makes a horrible, though magnificent, comparison between her three blows struck upon Agamemnon and the three libations at a banquet. But how does she view the comparison? Headlam regards it as meant seriously. He writes: "'My third blow was added as a prayer-offering to the *subterranean Zeus*'—as Hades may be called, for in the underworld his position corresponds to that of Zeus among the Olympian powers above.' And he accepts Enger's reading (of which Mr. Sidgwick also more or less approves), Διὸς νεκρῶν Σωτήρος κτέ. But though such an assimilation of Zeus and Pluto is by no means unfamiliar to Aeschylus (cp. *Supplikes*, 157 sq.) it is not necessary to alter the text here, even supposing the theology natural to the speaker; for the passage as it stands can be explained.

Verrall, who reads as above (with a comma after σωτήρος), translates: 'And when he had fallen, I gave him yet a third stroke, an offering of thanks to the nether god, to Hades, safe keeper of the dead.' In his note he remarks that there is 'an ambiguity in σωτήρ. Hades, the god of the lower world, is "the σωτήρ of the dead," in the sense that he "keeps them safely."' I cannot

¹ So Verrall, who omits the next line, μεσημβρινόισι θάλπεσιν τοῖς ἡλίον. If this is retained, ἐξ. will be merely 'resembling.'

believe that *σωτήρ* is capable of the meaning 'keeper,' 'he who holds fast,' or the like, except when the person or thing 'held' or 'kept' may conceivably be killed, harmed, or damaged but for the *σωτήρ*. Thus in *Ag.* 817, when the Queen calls Agamemnon *σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον*, the point of course is that the forestay helps to prevent destruction of the ship.

Therefore, *νεκρῶν σωτήρ* has, so to put it, no meaning; for *νεκροί* are past all *σωτηρία*. The significance of the phrase is left-handed, only to be reached by working from a significant phrase quite different from it, but suggested by it. To take a homely instance, one can only understand the algebraic statement 'I give him -9 horses' by working from the implication of giving +9 horses, and so at length finding that the sentence means, 'I take nine horses from him.' Hades no more 'saves' anyone than sportsmen are accustomed to studs of -9 horses. Clytaemnestra's language is a dreadful jest. One might in other circumstances say, 'I poured forth a third libation, an offering of thanks to Zeus who saves mankind.' And now she uses the recognized *form* of sentence with changes at each point to suit the truth. For *ἐπισπένδω* she says *ἐπενδίδωμι*, for *Διὸς Αἰδου*, for *βροτῶν νεκρῶν*, for *σωτήρος*—*φύλακος* she should have said, but with horrible irony she retains the word *σωτήρος*—clearly felt and meant to be now inappropriate—to keep before us the joyful ceremony which she has parodied. *σωτήρος* is so far from being a possible word with *νεκρῶν* that the latter is intended as destroying the meaning of *σωτήρος*, like the minus-sign instanced above. The mediaeval Abbot of Misrule was not an abbot of a new but genuine order. Instead of the Cistercian 'rule' or the 'rule' of St. Benedict we have mis-'rule,' the negation of 'rule,' the minus-sign again. The phrase plainly meant, therefore, a person who parodied an abbot, but was at the same time the negation of an abbot.

A similar phrase occurs in *Ag.* 1235, where Cassandra calls Clytaemnestra *θύουσας Αἰδου μητέρα*. *Αἰδου* corresponds to *νεκρῶν* in the passage just considered. The meaning is not 'Mother of Hell' or 'Mother of Death,' but 'raging unnatural mother.'¹ A mother is the source of life; the negating *Αἰδου* (which means here simply 'death,' as e.g. in *Αἶδην πόντιον*, v. 667) is meant to give the description the left-handed kind of effect already mentioned. The phrase is for a moment unintelligible until we work back from *τίκτουσα μήτηρ* or from *μήτηρ* itself, considered emphatically.² By a similar, but less audacious, device Pindar (*Ol.* II. 98 sq., Christ) calls his songs *εὐκλέας οἰστούς*, arrows which confer, not death, but immortality; and this use of what may be called the reversing epithet is in its milder forms fairly common.³

G. NORWOOD.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

¹ The title is, then, prophetic, and refers to the hatred between the Queen and her children, especially Orestes, in the *Choëphoroi*.

² Though in Eur. *Cyclops* 396, *τῷ θεοστύγῃ Αἰδου μαγείρῳ*, and in Aristias fr. 3 (Nauck), *Αἰδου τραπέζης* (both quoted by Headlam), *Αἰδου* does

mean simply 'accursed,' this does not affect the argument. In both cases it is probable that the language is modelled carelessly upon the passage in the *Agamemnon*.

³ Cp. the connecting genitives discussed above (vv. 437 sq.).

SOPHOCLEA.

VIII.

Oed. Tyr. 328.

πάντες γὰρ οὐ φρονεῖτ' · ἐγὼ δ' οὐ μὴ ποτε
τᾶμ' ὥς ἂν εἴπω μὴ τὰ σ' ἐκφήνω κακὰ.

After considering this couplet at intervals for over thirty years, I feel continually more and more strongly that Elmsley's explanation is the right one, i.e. that the construction is οὐ μὴ ποτε τὰ σὰ ἐκφήνω κακὰ ἵνα εἴπω τὰ ἐμὰ ἔπη, and that the second μὴ is only an emphatic repetition of the first.

The simplest way of taking the words is the obvious οὐ μὴ ποτε τὰμὰ, ὥς ἂν μὴ εἴπω τὰ σὰ, ἐκφήνω κακὰ. This may content you if you prefer grammar to sense, but if you do look at the sense, did anybody ever see such a ludicrously feeble and false statement? 'I will never reveal my woes.' *What* woes? If Tiresias had said 'my knowledge,' there would have been something in it; indeed Oedipus has commanded him to reveal his knowledge, μὴ φρονῶν γ' ἀποστραφῆς, and that is the answer he ought to make; with Elmsley's explanation it is the answer he does make. If he had said 'the woes of the city,' that also had been excellent sense. But his own particular woe was simply his blindness; perhaps one may add that his special knowledge was also a woe, but then what is the sense of saying 'not to call it thine'? 'I will not reveal my knowledge, not to call it thine,' is sheer absurdity, but that is what we are reduced to if we say that κακὰ means 'my knowledge.' Whatever explanation of κακὰ be adopted, the addition of ὥς ἂν μὴ τὰ σὰ εἴπω pulverizes it at once. And besides this 'my woes not to call them thine' is not in the style of Sophocles; it is in the style of the poet Bunn.

But, to make things worse than ever, this use of ὥς ἂν εἴπω is not even superior as grammar. Mr. Dobson, *C. R.* vol. xxiv., p. 144, has laid down the laws for the use of ὥς ἂν = ἵνα in tragedy, and this passage does not conform to them, if ὥς ἂν εἴπω is treated as a parenthetic remark, though Mr. Dobson himself failed to observe this. His instances make it clear. Aesch. *Cho.* 1021, ἀλλ', ὥς ἂν εἰδῇτ', . . . ἡνιοστροφῶ, *Rhesus* 420, ταῦθ', ὥς ἂν εἰδῆς, μέμφομαι, Eur. *Andr.* 1253, σὲ δ', ὥς ἂν εἰδῆς, ποιήσω θεόν, *Hel.* 1522, βέβηκεν, ὥς ἂν μάθης, *Or.* 534, ὥς οὖν ἂν εἰδῆς, μὴ πρᾶσσε, *Phoen.* 997, ὥς οὖν ἂν εἰδῇτ', εἴμι,

Iph. Aul. 1426, ὥς οὖν ἂν εἰδῆς θήσομαι. Thus the parenthetic use is confined to the single phrase 'I tell you this for your information.' Therefore grammar also compels us to make ὥς ἂν εἴπω depend upon οὐ μὴ ἐκφήνω.

In a very similar scene Tiresias tells Creon: ὄρσεις με τὰ κίνητα διὰ φρενῶν φράσαι (*Antig.* 1060). In both passages the idea is much the same; the prophet has things in his mind which he does not like to utter, and the King drives him to say them. τὰ μὰ in *Oed. Tyr.* is the same as τὰ κίνητα in *Antigone*. Only in *Oedipus* it is put rather more sarcastically; Tiresias will not tell the King the truth just for the pleasure of uttering his own knowledge.

Elmsley's view was accepted by Donaldson and Linwood, and I think it is really the only possible one. Elmsley himself only refers to *Antig.* 5, 6 for the reduplicated negative, ὁποῖον οὐ τῶν σῶν τε κἀμῶν οὐκ ὅπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν. Add *Trach.* 1014, οὐ πῦρ, οὐκ ἔγχος τις ὀνήσιμον οὐκ ἐπιτρέψει; *Electra* 1063, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰν Διὸς ἀστραπὴν . . . δαρὸν οὐκ ἀπόνητοι. *O. C.* 587, *Ajax* 970, frag. 761, are different. For repetition of μὴ there is nothing better to be had in Sophocles than μὴ, μὴ μ' ἀναξ at *Ajax* 191 (where by the way Morstadt's μὴ μηκέτ', ἀναξ is simply bad Greek),¹ and μηδαμῶς, μὴ πρὸς θεῶν at *Phil.* 1300; neither of these is any help. But Callimachus (*Delos* 89) has μήπω μὴ, where μὴ is repeated in the same way as Elmsley supposes and at a shorter interval.

There are thus three kinds of peculiar repetition of negatives in Sophocles, first a simple repeated οὐ, for which cf. Demosth. ix. 31, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου . . . οὐχ οὕτως ἔχουσιν, secondly a repetition after an oath, which is quite common in the orators in the form οὐ μὰ Δί', οὐ, see Wyse's *Isaeus*, p. 702, and *Clouds* 1066, [Heracl. Pont.] *Alleg. Hom.* 71, Longus iv. 18, οὐ μὰ—οὐδὲ—, thirdly this οὐ μήποτε—μὴ. Though there is not apparently any extant parallel to this which is quite exact, there is yet a very similar use, for οὐδὲ=ne quidem may be followed by a superfluous οὐ, Plato *Rep.* 426 B, 609 E, Demosth. xxvii. 65. This is surely much the same in principle; οὐ μὴ and οὐδὲ are both emphasized forms of οὐ, and as the one may be followed by a repeated negative, why not the other? And there is the general tendency to repeat negatives in Greek, as in vulgar English, which is so familiar that we may easily forget to consider it as symptomatic.

The case then stands thus. The ordinary way of translating the two lines in question is impossible because of its want of sense, of its feebleness of style, and of its abnormal use of ὥς ἂν. For Elmsley's explanation on the other hand there is no exact parallel to be found, but a consideration of Greek use of negatives does seem to me to make it highly probable, and it gives precisely the sense which Sophocles not only may but must have intended.

If οὐδὲ—οὐ and μήπω μὴ are both possible, there can be no insuperable difficulty about οὐ μήποτε μὴ.

It may be added that if 'not to call them thine' were the meaning, we should not expect τὰ σὰ but σὰ, and secondly that Lucian (*Timon* 5), ἵνα γὰρ τὰ κοινὰ ἐάσας τὰ μὰ εἴπω, shews what τὰ μ' ὥς ἂν εἴπω would naturally mean to

¹ We can say μὴ ἀναξ μηκέτι, not μὴ μηκέτι together.

a Greek ear. And lastly that ἦν μήποτε αὐτοὺς μὴ ἐξέλωσι in Thuc. viii. 46 would be a real parallel if it were not indisputably corrupt; qu. ἦν μήποτε αὐτοὺς πῃ (Goodhart) ἐξείργωσι, which seems to me better than -ξωσι as nearer the MSS. and better than Hude's ἐξελάσωσι in point of sense.

Oed. Tyr. 489.

τί γὰρ ἢ Λαβδακίδαις
ἢ τῷ Πολύβου νεῖκος ἔκειτ' οὔτε πάροιθέν ποτ' ἔγωγ' οὔτε τανῦν πω
ἔμαθον, πρὸς οὗτου δὴ βασάνῳ
ἐπὶ τὰν ἐπίδαμον φάτιν εἰμ' Οἰδιπόδα.

Four syllables are missing from the third line; it would be absurd to pretend to restore them, but there are certain considerations which have been unduly neglected in speculating upon them. The corresponding line is

φανερὰ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ πτερόεσσ' ἦλθε κόρα,

and the next line begins with the enclitic *ποτε*. Consequently we are justified in assuming as at least most probable that there is synaphea between these lines. Therefore *βασάνῳ ἐπὶ τὰν ἐπίδαμον* did not go together, and therefore the four missing syllables must be placed not before but after *βασάνῳ*. (In neither L nor A is there any division of lines between *βασάνῳ* and *ἐπὶ*, but that fact counts for little enough.)

This seems finally to dispose of Jebb's <βασανίζων> *βασάνῳ*; in any case that is one of those wretched emendations which prefer the eye to the brain; it is totally unlike the manner of Sophocles, who does not use such figures as this. Jebb could have written something much better himself, but it is a common thing enough to find scholars of repute attributing verses to a poet of which they would have been themselves ashamed because they are afraid of some noodle saying 'there is no reason for the corruption.' A very little investigation of MSS. will shew that when a word drops out the chances are that it did *not* begin with the same syllable as its neighbour, though no doubt it is more satisfactory to restore a missing word on that principle when one can do so with reason.

It seems then most probable that we have got to restore a choriambus after *βασάνῳ*, and that the last syllable of the choriambus must be long and must end with a consonant, for an elision here would be very unlikely. We must also provide a construction for *βασάνῳ*. Brunck's *χρησάμενος* does not satisfy the second of these requirements; it is based upon the scholion, which runs thus: *τίνος πράγματος κρίσει χρησάμενος τοῖς λεγομένοις πιστεύσω κατὰ Οἰδίποδος*; This might equally well suggest *πίστιν ἔχων* as the supplement; the construction *πίστιν ἔχω πρὸς τινι* seems possible enough, though I do not know that it is actually extant anywhere; but, as I said, it is useless to pretend to any exactitude.

Oed. Tyr. 719.

ἔρριψεν ἄλλων χερσὶν εἰς ἄβατον ὄρος.
κάνταυθ' Ἀπόλλων οὔτ' ἐκείνον ἤνυσεν
φονέα γενέσθαι πατρὸς οὔτε Λαίου
τὸ δεινὸν οὐφοβεῖτο πρὸς παιδὸς θανεῖν.

ἐνταῦθα is a little strange; at 582 it is much more natural, 'in that point,' but here it virtually stands for 'so' or 'thereby.' It is used in this forced manner for the sake of irony again, because in its natural sense it means 'there, on Cithaeron,' and it *was* there on Cithaeron, near enough for poetical purpose at any rate, that Apollo did bring it to pass that Oedipus slew Laius. That is why *ἤνυσεν* also is used here, for in the ironical sense it is very forcible; Apollo drove Oedipus to the place and the deed by the Delphic oracle, and so fulfilled, accomplished, the earlier oracle; as Iocasta intends the word there is not so much force in it.

What Iocasta says therefore is, as it struck the audience, 'there was he exposed, and there he did not kill Laius,' and the audience, with a shudder, felt 'there he did.'

Oed. Tyr. 772.

τῷ γὰρ ἂν καὶ μείζονα
λέξαιμ' ἂν ἢ σοὶ διὰ τύχης τοιᾶσδ' ἰὼν;

When I restored and explained this reading, I confess that I never thought of looking to see what the MSS. had. There it was staring everybody in the face, for L has *μείζοναῖ*, a manifest conflation of two readings, like *πλάναισι* in M at 67.

I rather think that there is a double meaning in the words *σοὶ διὰ τύχης τοιᾶσδ' ἰὼν*, which suggest 'entering into such relations with you,' relations the true nature of which are unknown to both. Or is this seeing too far into a milestone?

ARTHUR PLATT.

MSS. OF STRABO AT PARIS AND ETON.¹

[Continued.]

ONE cannot pretend to deal with the whole question of the textual criticism of Strabo on the strength of part of Book IX. Some conclusions, however, may be arrived at, since the MSS. we deal with are typical and Book IX. (and VIII.) contain the most vital part of Strabo for the question.

(1) P₅ as it is the oldest, so it is the best and most perfect MS. of Strabo. In the perfect parts no lacuna is visible, and none ever stood on its margins which have now disappeared, for it is beyond probability to suppose that lacunae which appear at all points in other MSS. should have always fallen on the beginnings and ends of the lines of this one and never in the centre. In this respect it stands apart from all other MSS., which either exhibit blanks in their text, or have closed them either by bringing the ends together or by inserting supplements.

(2) The system on which P₉ (i.e. the late hand of P₅) repaired P₅ is clear. As long as the palimpsest slips were attached to the original it was difficult to be certain, notwithstanding the printed facsimile in du Theil and Kramer's apparatus criticus, that P₉ had not copied P₅ before he attached his slips; but collation shows clearly that he first pasted the blank slips on, and then completed the lines; that is to say, he called in another MS. for the purpose. I give a list of the variations between P₅ and P₉:

	P ₅ .	P ₉ .
225 v. P ₅	θάτερον εὐρυχόροιο	κτ̃ θάτερον εὐρυχώροιο (ex ρῖο)
	οὐκ ἂν τοῦ θετιδίου	κάκ τοῦ θετιδίου ^{εί}
226 r. P ₅	μὲν οὖν ἐλλήνων καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ	οὖν om. ὑπὸ om.
	no original gap	gap (9-10) [8 cases]
226 v. P ₅	τῆς τραχίνος τοῦ τε ut vid.	τῆς om. τοῦ δ . . .
	τρυφήστοῦ	τρυφήσσος
	. . . ὅτερον	. . . στερον
	τῆς λαμίας	τῆς om.
	τὰς	τοῖς
]ιον· ἐρινέον sine lac.	lacuna after ἐρινέον (12-14)

¹ See Note 1 at end.

	P ₅ .	P ₉ .
226 v. P ₅	μελίταιαν incert.	μελίτειαν ἐρετρίαν
227 r. P ₅	no original gaps	two gaps
227 v. P ₅	θερμοπυλῶν	πυλῶν
227 v. P ₅	no original gaps διεστᾶσιν	nine gaps διεστήκασι
]σ	πόλεων
	ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ ποιητῆς	καταλέγει δ' ὁ ποιητῆς
	μέχρι	μεχρὶς
	καὶ	δὲ καὶ
	ἄγιον διέχουσι	ἄγαλμα διέχουσα
228 r. P ₅	no original gaps	four gaps
228 v. P ₅	λίμνη no original gaps	λίμνη om. three gaps
	ἱεροπολιτικῆς	ἱεραπολιτικῆς
229 r. P ₅	no original gaps τρίκκη	four gaps ἐκ τρίκκης
	λέγει	λέγεται
	οὔτε	ἦτε
	τῶν	τὸν
229 v.	εἴκοσι παρὰ	εἰκοσιεπτὰ περὶ
	κερφίου	ἐρφίου
	οἰκίας	οἰκείας
230 r.	φεραίων	τῶν φεραίων
230 v.	no original gaps	two gaps
231 r.	τε	καὶ
	οἰκισθῆναι	διοικισθῆναι

Even apart therefore from the gaps, the supplement does not coincide with what remains of the original. The supplementer covered his slips with the text of a second MS. (P₉).

(3) The MS. which the restorer of P₅ called in was either P₁ or one very like it. Kramer's apparatus (though Kramer admits his collations of P₁ are not complete) will show that the readings and the lacunae of P₁ and P₉ are all but identical. Kramer in fact believed, following Scrymgeour (part I. p. 23), that P₁, like the other MSS., was copied off P₉ (praef. lxi., lxvi.). That this cannot be so is shown (a) by the age of the two MSS. P₁ is certainly s. xiii.-xiv., if not s. xiii. The period of P₉ is more difficult to fix owing to the rough surface of the washed skin which has made the writing large and wild, but it is certainly later than P₁ (F. Haase's notion, *Rh. Mus.* 39. 448, that P₉ is s. xvi. is palpably wrong); (b) secondly, the readings of P₁ and P₉ do not always agree:

	P ₁ .	P ₉ .
605. 31 Mein.	μάνητες	μάνητες
606. 5	συνάπτον [12]	no lac.
27	τέσσαρα	τέτταρα
31	πυλιακοῦ	πῆλιακοῦ
607. 17	καὶ τοὺς	τοὺς
608. 24	πολλαὶ πόλεις	lac.
609. 21	φιλοκτήτω	φιλοκτήτη
22	no lac.	[9]
23	no lac.	[8]
611. 12	αὐτῶν	αὐτοῦ
613. 27	^{λασ} πελαγία	πελασγία
614. 17	μεσογαία τη	μεσογαία τὸ
615. 5	πέλας	πέρας
13	^{σθαι} τεθεῖναι	τεθεῖσθαι
622. 6	ἐνιήρες	αἰνιήρες
623. 1	οἱ οἴκησις	ἡ οἴκησις
6	lac. [4]	no lac.
8	ἄντα μύριον	ἄντα μύριοι

This is ample to show that the view that P₁ was copied from P₅ as restored is untenable. On the contrary, there is some evidence that P₉ was copied from P₁ (e.g. 613. 27, 615. 13). At all events, if the MS. from which the restorer of P₅ filled his vellum slips was not P₁, it was virtually its double.

(4) The question of the lacunae is the most interesting topic connected with the diplomatic tradition of Strabo. Probably every MS. of Strabo except P₅ and the excerpts shows some lacunae; many show an abundance. A blank left in a line is not a very common phenomenon in MSS. In verse it is hardly found. Omissions in prose authors are universal, but gaps or blanks are seldom left.¹ It is remarkable that the leaving of blanks in the line should be such a constant feature of Strabo. We find two sets of lacunae; those in P₁ P₉ (to mention Paris MSS. only), and those in the other Paris and the Eton MSS. I will first discuss the P₁ P₉ lacunae.

These coincide; they are found with regularity on the palimpsest slips with which P₉ repaired P₅'s margin. These repeated coincidences of the blanks in P₁'s text with the vanished margins of P₅ are striking, and suggested the natural conclusion that the damaged margins of P₅ were the origin of the lacunae in general; or, again, that the existing MSS. were copied from P₅ as repaired by P₉. A moment's consideration, however, shows that the first view is untenable. If P₁ (and the other MSS.) had descended from P₅ in its

¹ In the ninth-tenth century MSS., however, cognate with the Paris Plato grec 1809 (prose philosophical authors for the most part), lacunae

are found, either blank or filled with signs. See *J. Ph.* xxi. 48. One of these, Palatinus 398, contains a well-known epitome of Strabo.

mutilated condition, and reproduced its imperfect lines, P₁ would have shown a lacuna in every line of Book VIII. and Book IX., and not only so, but in every line of Book I. and the beginning of Book II. As this is not so, P₅ must be dismissed altogether from the question. That P₁ was not copied from P₅ when repaired, i.e. from P₉, we have shown above, and it is obvious from the list of lacunae below. The origin of the lacunae, therefore, must be sought elsewhere.

It may be observed that it is not certain that the original of P₉ had lacunae: thus 606. 5, where P₅ does not exist and P₉ writes the whole page, we find no lacunae in P₉, but P₁ gives us *συνάπτον 12 καλείσθω*, and that this is a real lacuna is shown by the loss of *καὶ τῷ παρνασῶ* before: again 618. 8 P₁ has *ὦν εἶναι 4 καὶ*, but P₉ joins *εἶναι καὶ*; 624. 6-7 P₁ gives us *ἡ οἷη διδύμους 4 ναίονσα κολωνούς*, recognizing the omission of *ἱεραούς*, P₉ covers the disposable space by writing *κο* very large. The origin of P₉ therefore may have been a MS. with filled lacunae, and the actual lacunae may be the result of fitting as it were a shorter text to the longer text of P₅.

However this may be, the lacunae in P₁ and P₉ are substantially the same, and they exist also in other MSS. (Vat. 174, Mosq., Escor.), the collation of which may perhaps contribute evidence. We have to notice that the lacunae in P₁ are much larger than they need be, and much larger than in P₉, which, as proved here and there by Homeric evidence,¹ are very near to the actual omissions. This is natural; the reproducer of a lacuna has nothing to guide his imagination; and as the table shows, the lacuna swelled with each copy. The limited space offered by a small-written tenth-century MS. like P₅ narrowed the possibilities. We may therefore take the lacunae in P₉ as more accurate. What was their origin?

Lacunae are usually caused by a defect in the original. Such are the famous gaps in Epictetus, due to the blot in the Bodleian original. It is difficult to see what defects in the eventual original of P₁ can have provoked the actual lacunae. Illegible spaces produced by damp, rubbing, or material eaten by rats, must occur at the same place in the same book. If we look at P₅ itself, the curve of damage is plain. The middle of the book is intact: the margins at both ends are as it were shorn away. But if we suppose, as seems natural, the original of P₁ P₉ to have been a tenth-century MS. of the compass of P₅ (and the original must have passed through this stage), it would seem to follow that the lacunae occurred in this MS. where they actually occur (on the palimpsest slips) on the margin of P₅. But if we work out these results we get a table (subjoined) which does not show the working of any conceivable mechanical agency. The lacunae occur partly in groups, three to four together, as we expect; but they do not recur at the same point of the page, nor are the intervals between their occurrence constant.

The next explanation to be invoked is that the lacunae are not due to

¹ E.g. 609. 28: 8 Homer, 8 P₉, 12 P₁; 608. 24: 6 Homer, 5 P₉, wrong word (*πρόλει*) P₁, 2, Et.

defect and damage, but to omission by scribes at a period when the text was arranged in narrow columns; that is, in the uncial period. This is the principle of which Professor Clark has made such extensive use of late. I cannot hope, however, for much assistance from it here. The Vatican palimpsest, the only uncial MS. of Strabo to which we can refer, is arranged in columns of 12-16 letters. The lacunae of P₉, which are most correct, vary between 19-20, 13-15, and 9-11. The proportions in which the different lengths occur are 12 for 19-20, 6 for 13-15, and 9 for 9-11. The most frequent length is too long for the uncial MS., the next frequent case is too short; and also neither 19-20 nor 9-11 can be called a multiple of 12-16. So far therefore as the evidence goes, I cannot see that the actual lacunae in P₉ are likely to be due to the omission of lines of an uncial original.

POSITION OF LACUNAE IN P₉.

225r.	225v.	226r.	226v.	227r.	227v.	228r.	228v.	229r.	229v.	230r.	230v.	231r.	231v.	232r.	232v.
line	line	line	line	line	line	line I	line	line	line	line	line	line	line	line	line
		4		3 4	5	4 6		5 6							3
		8													
		12 13 14	14			14		13 14							
					17 18 19 20 21		16 17 18			17 19					
		24			24 25 26					25					23 24
28		28													
30		30 31 32 33	32			29 30		33				29			
										35			33		

It remains that they are isolated phenomena due to the inability of the scribe to understand in each case the original. This appears to be real explanation of the second class of the lacunae, those in Et. P2. 3. 4. 7 (below); but it is obviously difficult to accept in the case of P1 P9. There is no apparent stumbling-block in the omissions, and their occurrence in groups suggests some more mechanical cause, whatever it was.

Possibly the collation of further MSS. containing this class of lacunae, and a study of the omissions in the MSS. of the Paris Plato school and in those of other prose authors¹ may suggest a solution.

Fortunately the question is not of vital importance for the constitution of the Strabonian text; for the size of each lacuna is fixed within tolerably narrow limits by its occurrence on the margin of P5 and by the occasional evidence of Homer.

(5) There are some lacunae in the later MSS. which are peculiar to them. These are most frequent in P7. They do not seem due to the causes, whatever they were, which produced the much more frequent gaps in P1 P9, but either to homoeoptosis in one of its forms (homoeoptosis has enormous scope in prose writers, as may be seen in the apparatus to Herodotus, or the Byzantine lawbook known as the νόμος Ῥοδίων ναυτικῆς), or to a difficulty frequent at the Renaissance of reading the original or being sure about an unusual word. For homoeoptosis cf. 609. 25, 612. 4, 613. 17 (ἀρξαμένους αἱ θερμοπύλαι [v. 19] P7. 8, ἀρξαμένων αἱ θερμοπύλαι P6), 616. 28 (P7), 625. 16 (this applies to P1 P9 also): for omission of a word cf. 605. 20 and 21, 614. 29 (δνος om., ὅρος P3. 4 Ald.), 623. 27 and 28, 624. 24. Some of these lacunae coincide with those in P1 P9 (viz. Nos. 5, 15, 22, 39, 57); but not more than 5 out of 68. They therefore seem to have developed independently of P1 P9; and are of small importance.

(6) All these MSS. except P1. 5. 9, in so far as they close or fill the lacunae of their original, tend partly to shorten the text, partly to render it unintelligible. A deliberate epitome presents itself in P6. 8, that which goes under the name of Gemistus Pletho from the heading in Ven. 379, which contains the epitome in the hand it would appear of its author (Kramer I. xlviii) and in O. The epitome was produced by omitting phrases or paragraphs, but the text given is often fuller than that of the other MSS.

There are other epitomes not represented at Paris. For the Chrestomathiae see grec 571, 1409.

(7) So far we have dealt with lacunae, existent and closed, and with intentional epitomes. Ordinary verbal variants in such a small piece of text would not repay collection. The Paris MSS., however, with the aid of Kramer's apparatus, may be connected with the other MSS. They fall into these classes:

(i) P5 stands by itself and was lacuna-less. It coincides more often with P1 P9 than with the later MSS.

¹ See Note 2 at end.

That it is not identical with P₁ appears from the following:

	P ₅	P ₁
622. 8	ἐθ[εντο ἀμφ' ἰ?] μερτὸν	ἔως τοῦ ἀμφ' ἰμερτὸν
21	ὑδωρ τὸ ρησίου	τοῦ δὲ τιταρησίου
29	νεσσωνίδα λ βοιβηίδα	λίμνην καὶ 6 βοιβηίδα
623. 11	τοιούτο	τοιούτον
623. 14	τυφλῶς	τυφλὸς
16	οἰκοῦσι	οἰκοῦσα
26	ἱξίωνος	ἱξιόνος
624. 2	πεδίφ	παῖδες
8	ἄντα μύριοι	ἄντα μύριον
625. 16	no gap	gap

(ii.) P₁ P₉ agree with Vat. 175, Mosc., and Escor. (ap. Kramer).

(iii.) Et. seems the parent of P₂ and Vat. 173.

Et. P₂ fill up lacunae, e.g. Nos. 9, 10 (below).

P₃ P₄ agree with Laur. 28. 5 and gave birth to the *Aldina*.

P₃ P₄ close lacunae, i.e., bring the ends together.

(iv.) P₆ P₈ are Gemistus' epitome.

(v.) P₇ agrees with Vat. 482 and Ven. 377.

I subjoin a table of all the lacunae in Books VIII. and IX. It is necessary to collect them seeing that the edition will contain only a minority, and those only from Book IX.

(1)	605. 20	Mein.	ἔθνη 7, 8 τῶν ὑπ' P ₇ .
(2)	21		μέρει 9, 10 αἰτωλικούς P ₇ .
(3)	606. 5		συνάπτον 12 καλείσθω P ₁ .
(4)	608. 9		ἔργων 7, 8 ταῦτα P ₉ .
			ἔργων 14, 15 ταῦτα P ₁ .
(5)	11		ὑπ 6 ἐναντιλογία ἐστὶ τότε ἄργος P ₉ .
			ὑπο 14 ἐναντιλογία ἐστὶ τότε ἄργος P ₁ .
	ib.		ἐν ἀντιλογία 8 τότε ἄργος P ₃ .
			ἐν ἀντιλογία 5 τότε ἄργος P ₄ .
	9-11		ἔργων· τότε ἄργος Et. P ₂ .
(6)	608. 24		πολλὰ 6 σ εἰσὶν P ₉ .
			πολλὰ πόλεις εἰσιν P ₁ , 2 Et. (Homer ἀχαιίδες).
(7)	609. 22		μαχομένους ἔχοντας μέδον 9 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ P ₉ .
			μέδοντα καὶ τοὺς Et. P ₁ . 2.
			μαχομένους καὶ τοὺς P ₃ . 4. 6. 7. 8.
(8)	23		πρωτεσιλάφ ποδάρκους 7-8 περὶ ὧν κοινῶς P ₉ .
			ποδάρκους περὶ P ₁ .
			πρωτεσιλάφ περὶ ὧν P ₆ . 7. 8.
(9)	25		φθίοι καὶ 50 ἰδίως δὲ πρὸ φθίων P ₄ (add. φαιδιμόντες ἐπειοὶ m. r.).

- φθίοι καὶ 10 πρὸ φθίων P7.
 φθίοι ιδίως δὲ P6. 8.
 φθίοι καὶ παιδιμόεντες ἐπειοὶ 32-33 ιδίως P3.
 (10) 28 ἀμυνόμενοι 8 τῶν ἐμάχοντο· τάχα δὲ P9.
 ἀμυνόμενοι 12 τῶν ἐμάχοντο P1.
 ἀμυνόμενοι μετ' αὐτῶν ἐμάχοντο Et. P2.
 ἀμυνόμενοι· τάχα δὲ P7.
 (11) 32 δ' ὑπὸ 9-10 τῆς φθίας P9.
 ὑπὸ 20, 21 τῆς φθίας P1.
 ὑπὸ τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ τῆς φθ. Et. P2. 3. 4.
 (12) 610. 4 Ἀχιλλεῖ γ 8 τῆς τραχινίας P9.
 Ἀχιλλεῖ 15, 16 τῆς P1.
 (13) 5 ἄρξαμένοι 8 δ' αὐτὸ P9.
 P9's space is shown to be correct by N700 (μετὰ
 Βοιω-).
 ἄρξαμένοι 12 δ' αὐτὸ P1.
 (14) 6 μαλιακοῦ 6, 7 περὶ P9.
 μαλιακοῦ 15 περὶ P1.
 (15) 610. 17 δόλοφιν· καὶ 5-6 δὲ παρατείνοντος P9.
 καὶ 14 δὲ παρ. P1.
 (16) 21 ἀφανισθεῖσαν δὲ συνα 14, 15 χρόνοις P9.
 συν 28, 9 χρόνοις P1.
 ἀφανισθεῖσαν τοῖς χρόνοις Et. P2.
 (17) 23 πρὸς το 8, 9 ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ P5.
 πρὸς τὸ 11 ὑπὸ δὲ P1.
 (18) 24 φθιώτιδες 18, 19 ὥτις καλεῖται P9.
 φθιώτιδες 27, 28 ὥτις καλεῖται P1.
 (19) 25 συνά 18, 9 σιν ὥσπερ P9.
 συνα 16, 7 σιν ὥς P1.
 (20) 26 ὀθρύος πρόπ 18, 9 ἡ φυλακὴ P9.
 προτ 22 ἡ φυλακὴ P1.
 πρότερον 12 ὥσπερ δὲ ἡ φυλακὴ Et.
 ——— 20, 21 ——— P2.
 (21) 611. 10 ἔχοντος 10 ἐκδιδόντος (v. 12) P7.
 (22) 611. 11 καλουμένον 4, 5 στερον ἐκδιδόντος P9.
 καλουμένον 8, 9 στεροι P1.
 (23) 30 ρος ἐρινεὸν 12-14 εἰαν ὁμώνυμον P9.
 ἐταῖρος ἐρινεὸν 20 κορώνειαν P1.
 ἐταῖρος ἐρινεὸν κορώνειαν P6. 8.
 ἐρινεὸν πρὸς τούτοις κορώνειαν P2. 3. 4 Et.
 (24) 612. 4-5 τῇ τῶν 4, 5 πρὸς νότον (v. 7) P7.
 (25) — 6 εὐρυπύλου· κ 12, 13 πρωτεσιλάου P9.
 εὐρυπύλου 25 πρωτεσιλάου P1.

- (26) — 7 κεκλιμέναις 6, 7 πρὸς νότον P9.
 — 13, 14 — P1.
 — 7 — Et.
 — 14, 15 — P2.
 — 10 — P3.
 — 12 — P4.
- (27) 612. 1 Mein. ἀκύφας ἐστὶ καὶ 11 καὶ ἀντίκιρα (v. 12) P7.
- (28) 613. 1 μετανάστας ἄνους 8 πρὸς δὲ P9.
 ἀνθρώπους πρὸς cet.
- (29) 8 ἀφανισθέντων ἄνων 5 καὶ τῆς χώρας P9.
 ἀνθρώπων καὶ P4. 7.
- (30) 18 ὀκρικὴν καὶ 8, 9 ν εἰρήκαμεν P9.
 καὶ 11, 12 εἰρήκαμεν P1.
- (31) 31 μέρη διε 19-20 ἰὰ τὸ ὀνομάζειν τοὺς τε ἡγεμόνας P9.
 διε 36, 7 ἡγεμόνας P1.
- (32) 32 ὑπ' αὐτοῖς 19-20 σ τὸν σύμπαντα τῆς θετταλίας P9.
 αὐτοῖς 32, 33 τῆς θετταλίας P1.
- (33) 614. 1 διέταξεν 19, 20 ουθούντας τούτῳ πάλιν P9.
 διέταξεν 25, 6 ἄλιν P1.
- (34) 2 ἐπάνω 19, 20 σεκπληρώσαμεν τὴν λοιπὴν P9.
 ἐπάνω 31, 32 λοιπὴν P1.
- (35) 3 τῆς χώ 17 ἐφεξῆς P9.
 χώ 25 ἐφεξῆς P1.
- (36) 6 τοίνυν 19, 20 τεσιλάφ P9.
 τοίνυν 24, 25 λάω P1.
- (37) 7 οὔσα τοῦ 19, 20 ντὸς τῆς P9.
 τοῦ 29 τῆς P1.
- (38) 8 οὐ μὴν τῆς 11, 12 ἡ μὲν οὖν φυλάκη P9
 τῆς 26 ἡ μὲν οὖν P1.
- (39) 21 εἴρηται δὲ π 11, 12 τῆς ἄρνης P9.
 δὲ 24, 25 τῆς P1.
- (40) 24 καὶ ὁ φύλλ 10 νος τοῦ φυλλαίου ἱερὸν καὶ ἔχναι P9.
 καὶ ὁ φύλλ 18 νος P1.
 καὶ 12, 13 καὶ ἔχναι P6.
- (41) 26 συντελείται 8, 9 τῆς ἀθαμανίας P9.
 συντελείται 18, 19 τῆς P1.
- (42) 614. 29 καλούμενον 4 ἄνθρωπος P6.
- (43) 615. 4 μαγνήσι 5, 6 καὶ τῆς πελασγιώτιδος P9.
 μαγνή 5 καὶ τῆς P1.
 μαγνή 9 καὶ τῆς Et. (τικῆς m. 2).
 μαγνητικῆς 10 καὶ τῆς P2.
 μαγνησ ι α ς P4.
 [13-15.]
- (44) 615. 9 ἰωλκοῦ δὲ 4 ἡ δ' ἰωλκὸς P6.
 ἰωλκοῦ δὲ εἴκοσιν om. O ?

- (45) — 20, 21 νηλίαν τε 9, 10 καὶ παγασὰς P1.
 ἔτι δὲ ῥιζοῦντα 10 σηπιάδα P9.
 δ' ῥιζοῦντα 22, 23 σηπιάδα P1.
 ἔτι δὲ 14 σηπιάδα P7.
- (46) 27, 8 διαφέρει ἢ δὲ βοιβηὶς πλησ — 5 — ἰάζει P9.
 λίμνη om. P2.
- (47) 616. 7 Mein. κικυνη 5 νήσον P7.
- (48) 616. 11 ἐμνήσθημεν δὲ καὶ πρότε 20 ων καὶ τῶν P9.
 πρότερον τῆς 26 καὶ τῶν P1.
- (49) 12 πελοποννήσῳ 20 ἰθμηται P9.
 ——— 21, 22 θμηται P1.
- (50) 14 θανμακία καὶ 20 ἦσ ἐξῆς P9.
 31, 2 ἐξῆς P1.
 ἐμνήσθημεν δὲ καὶ (om. P4) πρότερον καὶ τῆς ἐν
 πελοννήσῳ πρόκειται (v. 15) Et. P2. 3. 4. ἐμνήσθημεν
 δὲ καὶ πρότερον αὐτῆς· πρόκειται P6.
- (51) 28 μαγνησίας 5 ἀφηρεῖτο P7.
- (52) 617. 9 θετταλίαν· καὶ γὰρ τὰ παρατείνοντα τῇ φ 13
 ἀρξάμενος P9.
 τῇ φ 21 ἀρξάμενος P1.
 θετταλίαν ἀρξάμενος Et. P2. 3. 4.
 καὶ γὰρ 7 οἱ δ' εἶχον (v. 11) P7.
 θετταλίαν οἱ δ' εἶχον O P6. 8.
- (53) — 10 πίνδου 13 κάτω θετταλίας P9.
 — 8 — P1.
 πίνδου οἱ δ' εἶχον Et. P2. 3. 4.
- (54) 617. 18 δὲ καὶ 7 τὴν δολοπίαν P9.
 καὶ — 5 — τὴν δολοπίαν P1.
- (55) 19 οὔσα 7 μακεδονίαι P9.
 — 13, 14 — P1.
- (56) 620. 4 τοίνυν· 5, 6 λωι P9.
 — 19 λω P1.
- (57) 6 πλησίον καὶ 6, 7 τῶν· καὶ τὸ ἀστέριον P9.
 πλησίον· ἐ 5 τῶν P1.
 πλησίον καὶ τὸ ἀστέριον Et. P2. 3. 4. 6. 7.
- (58) 621. 18 λάρισσά ἐστι 19-20 ἡνυς P9.
 ἐστι 24, 5 ἡνυς P1.
 ἔστιν ἔνσυνα· τῆσδὲ Et. P2.
 ἐστι καὶ ἐν σύνα τῆς μυτιλήνυς P3 (σίνα) 4. 7
 (σίνα).
- (59) — 28 μεταξὺ αὐλό 12, 13 πλησίον τῶν P9.
 — 19 — P1.
 μεταξὺ — ὀδησοῦ (v. 29) om. cet.

- (60) 622. 29 νεσσωνίδα λίμνην καὶ 6 βοιβηίδα P9.
καὶ 5, 6 βοιβηίδα P1.
καὶ τὴν βοιβηίδα P2 Et.
- (61) 623. 27 ἐφύρους [?] διαπορεῖν P7.
- (62) ib. 28 θράκης 11 μεταθωρήσσεσθον O. P3. 6. 7. 8.
- (63) 624. 6 διδύμους 4 ναίουσα P1.
represented by διδύμους ναίουσα ΚΟλωνοὺς P9.
- (64) 24 Mein. ὁμόλι 8 μόλιν λέγεται P7.
- (65) 26 ἀρχὴν τοῦ 2 πηνειοῦ P9.
τῆς τοῦ P1.
τῆς om. Et. P4. 7.
- (66) 625. 17 εὐρίπον 10 ων τριακοσίων P9.
— 9, 10 ——— P1.
— 9 ——— Et.
— 12 ——— P2.
- (67) 626. 6 ἀπὸ ἐφ 14, 15 θεσπρωτίδος P1.
- (68) 7 θετταλοῦ 26, 7 ἐπελθόντας P2.
— 18, 9 ——— Et.
- (69) 9 χώραν ὀνομάσαι 20 καὶ νεσσωνίς P1.

NOTE 1.—The *Dictionary of National Biography*, article Scrymgeour, made me say (part I., p. 23) that Scrymgeour 'being appointed secretary to Bernard Bocnotel, Bishop of Rennes, visited Italy with that prelate,' etc. This statement caught the eye of my friend, Monsieur Léon Dorez, who informs me that the *D.N.B.* meant to allude to *Bernardin Bochetel*, who, according to the authorities (M. Dorez is obliging enough to refer me to Moreri, *Grand Dictionnaire historique*, 1759, t. II., 2^e partie, p. 7, col. 1; Fleury Vindry, *Les ambassadeurs français permanents au XVI^e siècle*, Paris, 1903, p. 38, No. 49; Edouard Rott, *Inventaire Sommaire des documents relatifs à l'histoire de Suisse conservés dans les archives et bibliothèques de Paris*, Berne, 1894, 5^e partie, pp. 31-32), was ambassador to Germany and to the Swiss Leagues at somewhat disputed dates between 1554 and 1569. We seem to see in Bernardin Bochetel's Swiss appointment the connection between the Scot and Geneva. It is not clear how either of them found themselves at Rome. M. Dorez, however, notes that Jean de Morvillier, Bishop of Orleans, ambassador in Italy, was Bochetel's maternal uncle.

NOTE 2.—The scribe of grec 1671 (Plutarch) says: τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἀσαφές τινός ἐστι διὰ τὸ πολλὰ διαφθάραι τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων μὴ δύνασθαι σώζειν τὴν συνέχειαν τοῦ λόγου. καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ παλαιὰν βίβλον ἐν ᾗ πολλὰ διαλείμματα ἦν ὡς μὴ δυνηθέντος τοῦ γράφοντος εὐρεῖν τὰ λείποντα, ἐλπίσαντος δ' ἴσως εὐρήσειν ἀλλαχοῦ. ἐνταῦθα μέντοι κατὰ συνέχειαν ἐγράφη τὰ διαλείποντα τῷ μηκέτι ἐλπίδας εἶναι τὰ λείποντα εὐρεθήσεσθαι. This remarkable passage, which recognizes both the gap and the closing of it, I take from Mr. Hall's *Companion to Classical Texts*, p. 187. Mr. Hall kindly tells me that it is printed on p. 1 of the preface to the Didot edition of Plutarch's *Moralia*, and in Cobet, *de arte interpretandi*, p. 67.

T. W. ALLEN.

NOTES ON PROCOPIUS OF CAESAREA.

IN the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* xxi. 52 Paul Maas states: 'Es ist das Verdienst von H. B. Dewing, zuerst erkannt zu haben, dass Prokop seine Satzschlüsse rhythmisch reguliert.' That this is only partly true appears from the remark of Heisenberg in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1901, Sp. 1481, who comments on it, and that in a case of text-criticism, and likewise from a remark of Crönert in the *Rheinisches Museum*, 54, 1899, 593. Dewing was the first to point out the connection between the rhythm of Procopius and Meyer's law and to collect specific statistical material, although his numbers are to a great extent of no practical value. Compare in this connection Maas *B.Z.* xix. 593 (Maas himself came to the conclusion later that he exaggerated in this article: *τά, μή, σύν, περί* should, according to Maas, here not be considered as accentuated). It appears to me that the correct statement of the end-rhythm of Procopius is that given by Maas for Constantinus Manasses, *B.Z.* xi. 505: 'Im Ausgang der Satzglieder musz die Zahl der zwischen den letzten beiden Hochtönen stehenden Silben eine gerade sein,' on condition that 0 is considered as an even number. Whether 6 and higher numbers are allowed may be contested. Sufficient stress has been laid upon the 0-form in Procopius, and that it was 'erstrebt' was first pointed out by Heisenberg and repeated by Dewing and Maas. When the origin of Meyer's law is sought in the avoidance of the iambic-trochaic rhythm, the 0-form is sufficiently explained, except in so far as it appears in a few (one?) writers only. In this way the law assumes a different character from that given to it by Dewing (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, xiv. 1910, 415-466), who keeps too strictly to Meyer's law and counts the 0-forms under the exceptions, thus arriving at 36.7 per cent. of these.

My intention is to point out that the clausula may occasionally indicate a wrong reading in the archetype, two examples of which I wish to mention. I quite agree with Maas that no emendation should be made to fit the clausula (*B.Z.* xxi. 53, A. 1), and restrict myself to cases supported by analogy, and only such where a clausula of the form $\sim \sim \sim \sim \dots$ is found in the MSS. I select one example from the *Bella Persica* and one from the *Bella Gothica*.

Bella Gothica I. 2, 11:

ἐλλεγόντες τε, ὅσοι δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγιοι ἦσαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν Ἀμαλασοῦνθαν ἐλθόντες, ἡτιῶντο οὐκ ὀρθῶς σφίσι, οὐδὲ ἢ ξυμφέρει τὸν βασιλέα παιδεύεσθαι. γράμματά τε γὰρ παρὰ πολὺ κεχωρίσθαι ἀνδρίας, καὶ . . . ἀποκρίνεσθαι . . . δεῖν τοῖνυν . . . τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις μελέτας ποιεῖσθαι.

Thus rightly Haury, according to V., which represents one of the two groups of MSS. which are taken into consideration by Haury in his edition. L. has *κεχώριται*, which is not only contrary to the clausula, but also departs from the row of infinitives.

That in I. 20, 8 the unanimous reading is wrong, is indicated by the clausula:

Πάλαι, ὦ στρατηγέ, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὐ τε καὶ καλῶς διώριται τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόματα, ἐν οἷς ἐν τῷδε ἐστί, θράσος κεχώριται ἀνδρείας.

That this passage should be emended also appears from B.P. II. 7, 28:

πάλαι δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὐ τε καὶ καλῶς διώριται τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόματα· ἐν οἷς καὶ τῷδε ἐστίν, ἀγνωμοσύνης κεχώριται ἀσθένειαν.

So Haury in agreement with P. Haury mentions a parallel reading from the *Excerpta Constantiniana* in H. This different reading of this MS. of less importance is not even mentioned by De Boor, being only one of the many textual variations in the readings of the two scholars. The rest of the MSS. of the *Excerpta* have *κεχωρίσθαι*. Here the expression *ἐν οἷς τῷδε ἐστίν* governs the accusative and infinitive. It would be interesting to know the reading of the group y_1 for *Bella G. I. 20, 8*. Compare Crönert, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1906, 393.

We have another case in B.P. II. 29, 29:

ἐτύγχανε δὲ (ὁ Γουβάζης) πολλῷ πρότερον—
Ἄλανούς τε καὶ Σαβείρους ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπαγόμενος—
οἵπερ ὁμολόγησαν κεντηναρίων τριῶν—
οὐχ' ὅσον ἀδήωτον Λαζοῖς ξυμφυλάξειν τὴν γῆν—
ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰβηρίαν οὕτω καταστήσασθαι ἀνδρῶν ἔρημον—
ὥς μὴδὲ Πέρσαις ἐνθένδε τὸ λοιπὸν ἵεναι δυνατὰ ἔσεσθαι.—

I distinguish six 'Satzglieder,' only one of which shows a wrong clausula, and that of the form ~ ~ ~ ~ . . ., of which only 2 per cent. have been found. Apart from unimportant textual variations this is the unanimous reading, from which the *Excerpta* differ, where we read:

. . . ὅτι Γουβάζης ὁ Λαζῶν βασιλεὺς Ἄλανούς καὶ Σαβίνους ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπηγάγετο, οἵπερ ὁμολόγησαν κ.τ.λ.

The supposition arises that the form *ἐπηγάγετο* is substituted for *ἐπ<αγ>αγόμενος*, a form which is repeatedly confused with *ἐπαγόμενος*. This supposition is considerably strengthened when we compare B.G. I. 1, 3:

ἐτύγχανον δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι χρόνῳ τινὶ πρότερον Σκίρους τε καὶ Ἄλανούς καὶ ἄλλα ἅττα Γοτθικὰ ἔθνη ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἐπαγαγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.

This method of investigation should certainly prove of value to future investigators.

A. W. DE GROOT.

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN,
HOLLAND.

TEXTUAL NOTES ON LUCAN VIII. AND SENECA DIALOGI.

LUCAN VIII. 102 sqq.

ubicumque iaces, ciuilibus armis
nostros ulta toros, ades huc atque exige poenas,
Iulia, crudelis placataque paelice caesa
Magno parce tuo.

So in this outburst of Cornelia should line 104 be punctuated. For the *poenas crudelis* compare VII. 431 'quod semper saeuas debet tibi Parthia *poenas*' and Verg. A. 6. 501 quis tam *crudelis* optauit sumere *poenas*? whence, or from *ib.* 585, 'uidi et *crudelis* dantem Salmonea *poenas*' we may suppose Lucan derived it. The feeble vulgate punctuation which puts the comma *after crudelis*, supposed to be vocative, well exemplifies the mischievous influence of propinquity.—I now find the correct punctuation in W. E. Weber's Corpus, but with the needless alteration of *crudel* e s.

383 sq.

sed longe tendere neruos
et, quo ferre uelint, permittere uolnera uentis.

This, the usual punctuation, is misleading, as the construction which it is more than probable Lucan intended was 'permittere uentis ferre uolnera quo uelint.' Comparison with 537 sqq. and 654 sq. may make this clear. The commas should be deleted, unless it be thought that it will conduce to intelligence to observe them on both sides of 'ferre.'

639 sqq.

O coniunx, ego te scelerata peremi.	
letiferae tibi causa morae fuit auia Lesbos,	640
et prior in Nili peruenit litora Caesar;	
nam cui ius alii sceleris? sed quisquis in istud	
a superis inmisit caput uel Caesaris irae	
uel tibi prospiciens, nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa	
uiscera sint Magni; properas atque ingeris ictus,	645
qua uotum est uicto. poenas non morte minores	
pendat et ante meum uideat caput.	

Cornelia, in the paroxysm of grief into which she has been thrown by the sight of her husband's murder, is demanding to share his fate, contending in

her frenzy that she should be killed before her husband has breathed his last. I have given the beginning of her speech as it stands in most of our editions, though I have not followed the Teubner text in preferring *sunt* to Latinity in 645.

Whether in 640 sq. the condition of Cornelia's mind is any excuse for the strangeness of her grammar, I will not venture to decide. Suffice it to say that the plea has not as yet been put in, and that no commentator or editor that I know of has discovered aught amiss in her expression. The words 'sed quisquis—prospiciens' are paraphrased in the edition of C. H. Weise 'sed tu, quisquis es, qui ad Pompeium interficiendum a superis immissus es, uel Caesari uel tibi consulens; me potius pete atque interfice' with an ample adjunct to the original. In Haskins we read: 'quisquis'] 'whoe'er thou art who hast been despatched by the gods to take this life'; and the notes following tell us that *uel . . . uel* is 'equivalent to *sive . . . sive*,' and that *prospiciens* means 'having regard to.' There is nothing here or elsewhere to enlighten us as to how or why it is that 'quisquis . . . immisce' should stand for 'quisquis immissus es.' It is undoubtedly true that poets take upon themselves to use the vocative where the nominative is normal; it is true also that Lucan is prone to dispense with the substantive verb. But neither the licentious juxtaposition in Statius *Theb.* 7. 775 sqq. 'uade, diu populis promissa uoluptas | Elysiis, certe non *perpessure* Creontis | imperia aut uetito nudus iaciture sepulcro,' and the less abnormal usage in Horace *S.* 2. 6. 20¹ on the one hand, nor, on the other, the harsh absence of *es* in VI. 615 sqq. 'sed si praenoscere casus | *contentus*, facilesque aditus multique patebunt | ad uerum' can be relied on to sustain our double anomaly. This way then is closed. Let us try if there is any other. Some advocate of what is written might perhaps submit that *immisce* is a true vocative and *quisquis* in loose apposition to it. In this case *quisquis* would have the use either of *quicumque* or of *quisque*. Now that *quicumque* and similar compounds with *cumque* are used without any verbal adjunct is well known. '*qualiscumque* mihi tuque, puella, uale' Prop. 4. 21. 16 may serve as an example; and there are employments of *quisquis* which partially correspond. But neither in case nor in sense are these analogous to what would have to be assumed here. Examples will make this plain: 'mirum ni illoc homine *quoquo* pacto opust' 'in any way we can get him' Terence *Eun.* 1083, 'liberos suos *quibusquibus* Romanis in eam conditionem ut manu mitterentur mancipio dabant' Livy 41. 8. 10, and Catullus 68. 28 (though this is uncertain) '*quisquis* de meliore nota.'² Nor

¹ 'Matutine pater seu "Iane" libentius audis'; so for the modern's benefit should the words be printed. There is really no reason against this vocative any more than against that in the fragment of Callimachus Schol. Par. ad *Apoll.* Rh. 2. 866 ἀντὶ γὰρ ἐκλήθη 'Τυβρασε' Παρθενίον.

² Here may be mentioned incidentally a use of *si quis* which, uncommon as it is, seems to have escaped the notice of all editors but

Francken, IV. 316 sqq. 'tunc herbas frondesque terunt et rore madentis | destingunt ramos, ac si quos palmitis crudo | arboris aut tenera sucos pressere medulla.' The Dutch editor proposed to interchange the places of *si quos* and *sucos*. But the truth appears to be that the pronoun has, more Gracco, been attracted into the case of an antecedent in the main clause.

again does the use of *quisquis* discussed by Madvig on Cic. *Fin.* 5. 24 help us any more. Waiving the question of gender, this sense of *quisquis* seems confined to the earlier writers and, as an archaism, would be improbable for Lucan. Furthermore, in this idiom the pronoun is practically an enclitic, being confined to subsidiary (and chiefly relative) clauses and expressions like *primum quicquid*. It appears then impossible to obtain from the words the sense of 'you the unidentified minister of heaven's murderous command' which Greek might have given by adding *τις* to a substantive with the article, Soph. *O. C.* 288 sq. ὅταν δ' ὁ κύριος | παρῇ τις, or Latin by *ille quidem* (Plaut. *Trin.* 342, etc.).

Accordingly we are forced by nothing short of grammatical necessity to find a proper verb for the subject *quisquis* and to give the vocative *inmisse* its customary value. This may be done in either of two ways between which I find it hard to choose.

The necessary finite verb may be provided by the slight change of *prospiciēs* to *prospiciēs*. Then Cornelia, addressing the unknown assassin, will say 'You have been appointed by the powers above to kill my husband. Very well; but if it is any object to you to gratify Caesar's passion or to profit yourself, then you will secure your end by killing me too.' The tense is future because the action is referred to the time of *pendat* and *uideat*.

The alternative is to leave the text as it stands, but to punctuate so that *quisquis* is referred to *nescis* and 'properas—uicto' form a parenthesis thus:

sed quisquis, in istud
a superis inmisse caput, uel Caesaris irae
uel tibi prospiciens, nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa
uiscera sunt Magni (properas atque ingeris ictus
qua uotum est uicto), poenas non morte minores
pendat et ante meum uideat caput.

The connexion of thought then will be, 'Murderer who do not know your business, let me tell you what to do; kill me under your victim's eyes before they are closed in death.'

800 sqq.

These lines usually appear with a full-stop after 'potest' (804) and a comma after 'haeserit' (805). They would be better punctuated as follows:

si tota est Herculis Oete
et iuga tota uacant Bromio Nyseia, quare
unus in Aegypto (est) Magni lapis? omnia Lagi
rura tenere potest si nullo caespite nomen
haeserit; erremus populi cinerumque tuorum,
Magne, metu nullas Nili calcemus harenas.

The sentence containing *potest*, abrupt and unnatural if it stands by itself, forms a legitimate variation of the apodosis to a conditional clause. Compare,

si tanti est, Cic. *Fin.* I. 54 'quod si ne ipsarum quidem uirtutum laus (in qua maxime ceterorum philosophorum exultat oratio) reperire exitum *potest* nisi *derigatur* ad uoluptatem' e.q.s.

As the foregoing remarks have dealt mainly with corrections of the current punctuation of Lucan VIII. I subjoin further examples, in which I now find that my re-punctuation has been already proposed.

53 sq.

quid perdis tempora luctus?
cum possis iam flere, times?

So W. E. Weber; 'times.' stands in recent texts.

517 sqq.

iam crimen habemus
purgandum gladio quod nobis sceptrum senatus
te suadente dedit, uotis tua fouimus arma.

'dedit,' as the last words form the second member of the *quod* clause. So apparently C. F. Weber; 'dedit.' our recent texts.

I will conclude with two emendations of the *Dialogues* of Seneca, a work whose influence is very apparent in this book of Lucan, and to which Mr. Duff's recent edition of X.-XII. will no doubt direct the attention of English students.

SENECA *Dialogus* X. 14. 3.

quam multi hesternae crapula semisomnes et graues illis miseris suum somnum rumpentibus ut alienum expectent, uix adleuatis *labris* insusurratum miliens nomen oscitatione superbissima reddent.

My lord has not recovered from the debauch of yesterday when your humble servant pays his morning call; and only after countless promptings from his 'remembrancer' can he produce his visitor's name. In such a context *oscitatio* can have one sense only. It must mean 'yawning,' and this makes any reference to the yawner's lips absurd. Nor, again, can the lips be the *nomenculator's*, as the Teubner editor suggests, with the apology that the insipid phrase is due to Seneca's excessive love of antithesis. For *labris* read *auribus*, dative after *insusurratum*. Our drowsy magnate will hardly raise his ears from the cushion to catch the name that is whispered into it. Cf. Suetonius *Cal.* 22 'interdium uero cum Capitolino Ioue secreto fabulatur, modo *insusurrans* ac praebens in uicem aurem,' Cic. *Q. Fr.* I. I. 13 'aures . . . in quas ficte et simulate quaestus causa *insusurretur*' with other passages cited by the lexicons.

X. 13. 9.

alia deinceps innumerabilia quae aut *farta* sunt mendaciis aut similia.

There seems to be no proof that *fartus* was ever used, except in the sense of stuffing or packing *material* objects. It cannot therefore be made a

synonym for *refertus*. *sarta* 'patched up' is an easy and both by sense and assonance¹ a suitable correction. We find the verb applied to trumped up stories in Plautus *Epidicus* 455 'proin tu alium quaeras quoi centones sarcias' where also it has been corrupted to *farcias*.

XI. 18. 5.

numquam autem ego a te, ne ex toto maereas, exigam.

The sense is not 'I won't require you not to mourn altogether' but 'altogether not to mourn' ('ut maerorem ex toto deponas' Duff). And for this we expect '*ex toto ne maereas*.'

XII. 9. 2.

quo longiores porticus expedierint, quo altius turres sustulerint, quo latius uicos *porrexerint*, quo depressius aestiuos specus foderint, quo maiori mole fastigia cenationum subdixerint, hoc plus erit quod illis caelum abscondat.

A good example of how long an unfortunate conjecture may usurp a place in a text. Mr. Duff translates 'the wider they make their streets.' But he comments on the improper use of *uicos*, which elsewhere are the 'public streets,' not such as may belong to the rich man and form part of his great mansion. Still this is nothing to the irrelevance of *porrexerint* which he also notes: 'The result of making wider streets is to give a larger view of the sky.' *porrexerint* however is from Pincianus, the Ambrosian MS. has *correxerint*, and the correction is as futile as it is facile. Seneca in these *Dialogues* has Caligula and his extravagances perpetually before his eyes, and one of the freaks of this imperial ape and tiger is mentioned in the chapter of Suetonius cited above 'super templum Diui Augusti ponte transmisso Palatium Capitoliumque coniunxit.' *correxerint* then conceals *contexerint*. Such coverings of the streets may obviously be said to hide the sky. It is not difficult to see how the corruption arose. *contexerint* was read *convexerint* (that *conrigo* is the original spelling of the tradition we know from 'conriget' *Clem.* 7. 1), and this again passed to *correxerint*. For the verb compare Seneca the Elder *Suas.* 2. 3 (of Xerxes bridging the sea) 'montes perforat, maria *contegit*.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL,
February 24, 1915.

¹ Cf. e.g. *Dial.* 1. 20. 4. 'Sullano scias saeculo scriptam.'

INDO-EUROPEAN INITIAL VARIANTS *DY-* (Z-) / *Y-* / *D-*.

1. THE following paper will undertake to demonstrate an I.E. root *dyu* (alternating with *du* and *yu*) 'iungere,' and its synonymous correlatives *dyem* / *dyā* (cf. *dru drem drā* ap. Brugmann, *Kvg.* § 367), *dyā-t-* / *dyat*, *dyes* / *dyō[u]*s (cf. *trem* / *tres*, ap. loc. cit.).

2. Sound and sense units (roots) that we can write for Sanskrit as *yam* (parallel with *yā* as *gam*: *gā*, *dram*: *drā*) *yat yās* present themselves in words that we may rubricate in selected examples as follows:

3. A. **Binding (stringing)**: Skr. *sañ-yama-* 'fesselung,' *ud-yāmá-* 'strang'; *sañ-yāt-* 'verbindungs-mittel' (also 'rendezvous, engagement, hostile encounter'); Av. *yās-ia-* 'cinctus,' O. Bulg. *po-jas-u* 'cingulum,' *ζῶστρον* 'belt.' Note *Zḗthos*, binder of Dirce, fetcher (cf. D.) of building stones.

4. B. **Punishment** (inflicted by binding, cf. Lat. *uincula* 'prison'): Skr. *yan-trin-* 'tormentor,' *ζων-τείον* 'pistrinum' (for punishing domestic servants, but see Stephanus, *Thes.* s.v. for the complications), *ζᾱμ-ία* 'poena'; cf. from *yā* (Greek *ζη-*), Skr. *yā-tár* 'avenger': *ζη-τρός* (like *δαι-τρός*) 'public torturer,' *ζη-τρίον* (Herondas, 5. 32) 'ergastulum'; Skr. *yāt-ana-* 'poena,' *ῥῆ-α-γῑ-τ-* (also *ῥᾱ* / *ῥᾱvan-*) 'schuld-verfolgend,' *yāt-ú-* (? or *yā-tú-*) 'spook': Av. *yātu-* 'wizard; ars magica'; *ζῶσ-τειον* (Aristophanes) 'ergastulum,' Skr. *vi-* and *ava-yāśá-* 'tormenting demons in Yama's world.'

5. C. (cf. E.) **Viscous** (i.e. bound, binding or combined) **fluids**: *ζωμ-ός* (? or *ζω[σ]-μός*) 'soup, ius'; Skr. *nir-yāsa* 'exudation from trees, resin, milk, thick fluid.' For the semantic connection of this pair with the root *yu(g)* 'iungere' see Boisacq, s.v. *ζῶμη*.¹

6. D. **Stretch and strain, effort, desire** (Germ. *anstrengung*: *strang* bridges the connection with A.): *ud-yama-* 'anstrengung,' *ud-yāmá-* 'aufspannen'; *yat-na-* 'bemühung' (cf. the root *yat* with the senses 'concertare'; middle, 'petere, impetrare'), *ζᾱτ-έω* 'petere'; *ud-yāsa-* 'anstrengung': *ζᾱ[σ]-λος* 'anstrengung.' Note *ā + yas* = 'to strain a bow' (caus. ptc. *an-āyāsita-* 'unstrung'), *yas* 'sich anstrengen.'

7. E. (cf. C.) **Raising** (perhaps generalized from stringing up), **rising, fermenting**: *ud-yama-* 'erhebung,' *ud-yāmá-* 'aufrichten'; *ud-yat-i-* (? or *ud-ya-ti-*) 'erhebung'; *yas* 'to foam, ira feruere,' *ζέω* 'feruere.'² In this

¹ By the semantic development here in question we might derive Lat. *cinnus* 'mixture' from **cingnos*: *cingit*, but see *Cl. Quart.* iv. 89.

² Note Av. *yaoz* 'feruere' (of water), extended from *yu*.

group belongs Av. *yāh-* 'crisis, turning-point,' very adequately defined by ἀκμή = 'summit, height' (exx. ap. Bartholomae, *Wbch.*). For a similar connotation of Latin *gerit* 'heaves' see § 21. See § 31 for the sense of 'swelling' (rising).

8. F. **Giving**: Skr. *yācchati* (from *yam*) = 'donat' (see parallels from *yu*, § 10, fn.). The sense may have arisen as in Germ. *binden anbinden*, cf. *angebinde* 'present' (bound on neck or arm).

9. As regards the forms hitherto cited as cognates of Skr. *yās*, we can be perfectly sure that their I.E. root was *yō[u]s*. The *ā* of *ζᾱμία ζᾱλος ζατέω* may come from the root *dyā* parallel with *dyem*, whose *e*-vocalism is to be further established below. The Celtic and German cognates of Skr. *yāt* at least admit *e*-vocalism (v. Pedersen, *Gram.* 1, 65; Kluge, *Wbch.* s.v. *gāten*).

10. Greek ζ-. I have previously studied words belonging to the above group under the theory of a spirantic initial *y*, different from the ordinary semi-vocalic *y*. The Greek words concerned fall into the groups (1) cognates of *ζυγόν* 'yoke'; (2) of *ζωμός*: Lat. *iūs* 'soup,' *ζῆ-μη* 'leaven' (die hefe); (3) of *ζωστήρ* 'cingulum'; (4) of *ζέει* 'boils,' plus the isolated words (5) *ζειά* 'spelt' and (6) *ζόρξ* 'gazelle.' For the first three groups the sense was in each case 'binding' (see e.g. Boisacq, s.vv. *ζυγόν ζύμη ζωστήρ*), and it may be here again remarked that Skr. *yu* 'iungere' stands in the same phonetic correlation with *yam* (*yā* 'uincire; donare'¹ as *dru* 'currere' to *dram* (*drā*). So for the first three groups we may write the pre-Sanskrit root as *yu* (weak stage), with the extension *yō[u]s*. Beside *yu* stood a synonymous root *dē(y)* in *δίδημι*, Av. *dyā*, Skr. *dyāti* 'binds.' If we had Skr. *dyāuti*, who would doubt that it was a blend of *dyāti* and *yāuti* 'combines'?² In this hypothetical *dy-* I see the condition to which we must really refer the ζ- of our Greek words.

11. A similar origin may be argued for the ζ of *ζέει* 'heaves, foams, boils, ferments.' If the primate of *ζύμη* 'leaven' was * < d > *yū(s)-mā*, and of O. Eng. *gist* 'yeast' was **yes-to-*, we may assume an analogical * < d > *yesto-*, and for *ζέει* and its kin a root *dyes*. After modern psychological investigations such as those summarized by Oertel in his *Study of Language* (p. 161 sq.), the reluctance to admit blending is a mere prejudice. Twice in the first draft of this paper e.g. I wrote protruberance with an *r* intrusive from protrude. What does happen in the examinable present is our surest guide to what has happened in the unexaminable past. There is no reason to suppose the word-psychology of the Indo-European races has changed profoundly in our or any previous time.

12. Of the isolated words, *ζορκάς* has a rival form *δορκάς*, explained as due to popular etymology from *δέρκομαι*. If we predate the popular ety-

¹ Likewise *yu* (with the dative) = 'verschaffen,' i.e. 'donare'; and so does *yuf* (*P.W.*² s.v. 11) 'Jmd. (acc.) mit etwas (instr.) verbinden, beschenken mit': Av. *yaog* (4) 'theilhaftig machen (dat.).' Perhaps the root *dō* 'dare' (*δίδομι*) is but a specialization of *dē(y)* 'uincire' (*δίδημι*).

Cf. Skr. *dāman-* 'donum; uinculum.'

² Perhaps P. Persson, who seems to fear that his root determinants are threatened by Bloomfield's blended congeneric roots. There is no conflict between the theories, properly balanced and correlated.

mology to a time when *york-* was being spoken, the blended form *dyork-* is certainly thinkable, I should rather say, admissible. But since the reason for a popular etymology always exists, and is as valid as the reason for a true one, we may even throw *dyork-* back to the I.E. period, in which case *ζορκάς* / *δορκάς* is dialectic, like *Ζεύς* / *Δεύς*. Note that Plato (*Krat.* 419 B) explained *ζημιῶδες* by *δημιῶδες*. The possibility that *ζόρξ* is a loan-word must, however, always remain open (see Bezzenberger, *Beitr.* 4. 316³).

13. The remaining Greek word is *ζεαί* 'spelt': Indo-Iranian *yava-* 'getreide.' What did I.E. *yevō-* really mean? In view of Germ. *getreide* 'getragenes,' *καρπός* 'carptum,'¹ or Eng. *crop* (which seems to have started first as a noun = 'stalk-and-head of grain,' then to have turned verbal = 'to head,' i.e. 'reap the heads,'² and last to have yielded 'carptum'), I suppose *yevō-* to have meant quasi 'uinctum,' of the bound up bundles, and in Homer *ζεαί* is in fact fodder (i.e. bundles of grain); cf. *δεται* 'faggot' (bundle of twigs), and on Lat. *gello* § 31. But the meaning may have developed from 'puls,' cf. O.Ir. *híth* 'puls': *ζύμη* (see Pedersen, *Gram.* 1, § 44, anm. 2).

14. I have now accounted for all the cases of *ζ-* = Skr. *y-*³ by the assumption of the influence of the root *dē(y)* / *dy* on the roots in *y-*, and I venture to recommend this simple accounting for *ζ-* to all who have given heed to Sommer's complicated explanations (e.g. Hirt, *Gr. Gram.*² § 232, anm. 1—but not Thumb in Brugmann-Thumb,⁴ § 118). What physiological likelihood exists that a following *h* would change a *y-*, en route to an *h-*, into a sonant *ζ-*; or that the *st* of *ζωστήρ* similarly affected a *y*? And the explanation of *ζύμη*

¹ Diez' derivation of Fr. *blé* from Lat. *ablatum* is rejected by Meyer-Lübke for no good semantic reason. Historical evidence such as we have for *getreide* = 'getragenes' is lacking, but note Ennius, S. 48, *avenam lolium . . . selegit secernit aufert*; Pliny, *Pan.* 29, *perituræ in horreis messes auferuntur* (cf. *stolonibus ablatis*, Pliny, *N.H.* 17, 95); Augustine, *Ciu.* 4, 8, *cum runcantur <frumenta>, id est a terra auferuntur* (cf. Cicero, *Verr.* II. 3, 97, *frumentum omne in decumas auferre iusserit*): surely these examples afford some warrant for the derivation of *blé* from 'ablatum' (siue ex agro siue in horreum); cf. (*uin-*)*demia*. As for Lat. *secāle*, 'a sort of grain,' if Walde had been alive to the metrical facts behind the word *tórāl* (Varro, ap. Non. 11, 16) and *torāle* (ib. *L.L.* V. 167), he would not so arbitrarily have rejected derivation from *secāre*.

The *ē* of the Romance primate **secāle* may be due to Campanian *secula* 'sickle' (cf. Varro, *L.L.* V, 137), which may be diminutive to *sica*, and originally have had *ē* (*ae*), cf. *spēca* / *spica* (also rustic). Observe Skr. *pānīya-m* 'bibendum,' but = 'drink, water'; and Lith. *kūstinas*, defined by Kurschat as 'was zu hauen ist' z. B. das getreide.

² The newly grown up rubric for denominatives, viz. 'privative,' is perfectly futile. The denominative verb indicates the use to which its

noun primate is put. Thus Eng. *straps* = uinct, plectit (flogs); acuit (!). Or it indicates what its primate enters into or suffers. Thus a *skin* usually suffers removal, and to *skin* generally means 'to remove a skin,' but it may mean 'to cover with skin' (Horace's *ovēs pellitæ*). Or the primate furnishes a note of resemblance, as in 'the bullet mushrooms.'

³ There is another form I accept (after Uhlenbeck) in *Ζέφυρος* 'fecundans' (as producer of the flowers; or as 'amorum copulator'): Skr. *yabh* 'copulare' (sexual sense), parallel with *yam* 'uincire' (cf. *upa* + *yam* 'to marry' and also 'inire feminam'), and shifted under the influence of the root *wēbh-* 'to weave.' In *ζόφος* I see the 'locus uinctionis' (prison, confinement), in Yama's world, to wit Hades. In the Slavic tongues the root *yēbh* may have meant 'angreifen' (so Brugmann, *IF.* XXXII. 324), cf. *yem* 'ergreifen.' I would again start from the sense 'copulare,' whence, with hostile sense rather than the more usual sexual connotation, 'to quarrel with, abuse' (cf. Lat. *coire*, ap. *Thes. L.L.* III. 1417, 63, in contrast with *ib.* 1418, 7). There was no I.E. root *oyēbh* 'futurare,' nor do I look on *αἰφω* as a compound of *ū-* + *y(e)bh-* (so Brugmann, *l.c.* 326), but rather as an extension of *ei* 'ire,' cf. O. Lat. *oitor* (see on its sexual sense the lexica, and cf. *Cl. Quart.* vii. 203, § 9).

requires us to separate *ūmeis* from Skr. *yugma-* for a hypothetical *us-* (: Skr. *vas*). Sommer's explanation of his *ζ*'s takes into the reckoning nearly as many special factors as there are words in *ζ-*, and produces results almost as flexible as the Curtian phonetics. To explain the *ζ* of *ζόρξ* from the *px* is as incredible as the Curtian explanation of *-ζ-* in the denominatives from *-y-*.

15. The I.E. alternation of *dy-/y-*. But the Greek *ζ-* may go back to I.E. *dy-*. Thus we have in Gāthic Avestan *ā + dyav* 'studere' (*ādīvyaintī + loc.* = 'curant de'), but in the later language *yav* 'intendere' (cf. *yaonəm āste* = 'curare perseuerat' [lit. 'sedet']). These roots cannot be alien to one another, nor to Skr. *dyu* 'losfahren auf, angreifen' (i.e. 'petere'), which is rare but Epic; cf. *AV. XI. 10, 16*, where *yutāni* (see *PW.*² s.v. *yu*, 3) = 'petat' (for 'petere faciat'). For these senses further note, always bearing in mind the relation of *yuj* to its synonym *yu* 'iungere,' how *yu* 'apere' takes the completive sense of 'adipisci' (*PW.*² s.v., 2; in *RV. VII. 34, 12, ādyum . . . çāmsam* makes excellent sense as 'ineptam laudem'), while *abhi + yuj* = 'angreifen.' For the generalized sense of 'studere' in these verbs compare the following definitions, all taken from or based on *PW.*²: *yujyamāna-* 'beschäftigt mit' (loc.); *yuj* (6) 'eine zuneigung, u.s.w. Jmd. (loc.) gewenden'; (7) 'den sinn (e.g. *manas*) auf einen punkt (loc.) richten'; *vi + upa + yuj* 'sich kümmern um' (loc.); *yuktā* 'bedacht auf (loc.), beschäftigt mit (instr.), versenkt in' (loc.); *abhi + yukta-* 'devoted to'.¹ Gāthic *dyav* corresponds with Skr. *dīvyati* 'plays (with dice), wagers,' cf. *pra-yuj* 'to throw' (dice). The sparse beginnings of *dīvyā-* in *RV.* suggest that it was a special development from a locution = 'to join or couple (in play) with dice (for this or that).' It would be wrong to infer from the sense 'to throw' (dice) and from the words for 'weapon,' *didyū-/ didyūt-* (really = 'fulmen,' v. Uhlenbeck, s.vv.), a root *dyu* 'iacere.'

16. Further specializations of meaning of the root (*d*)*yu* 'iungere' are found in Skr. [*d*] *yu-dh-yāti* 'iungit bellum, dimicat.' In Lat. *iubet* the sense took the direction of 'enjoins,' cf. *yuj* (*PW.*² 5) 'auftragen, befehlen, iniungere.' O. Lat. *iouat* meant (I surmise) 'joins as a helper' whence 'helps' (so already in *TAPA. XLI. 49*), cf. Skr. *yū- / yuj- / yuñj-*, all = 'comes, socius.' The Avestan ritual verb *yaož-dā-* 'heil machen' exhibits but a greater specialization of sense of the kindred, but not identical, complex *iure facere*. In Sanskrit, *yōni-* was a 'locus coniunctionis,' developing on the one hand the sense of

¹ Skr. *ādyūna-s* 'gefrässig' is haplogically shortened from **adyāyūnas* 'to food devoted,' cf. *ādyā-m* 'food' (Lat. *inādia*); and *yūna-* (Sūtra word) 'vinculum.' For the sense observe *uino te deuincis* (Plautus, *Ps. 221*) 'thou art devoted to (addicted to) wine.' Latin *jāyūnus / jēyūnus* are reduplicated forms, i.e. **jaijūnus* (cf. *παι-φάσω* and *παι-πάλλω*), whence *jāyūnus* (cf. *Sāturnus*, older *Saeturnus*) and *jēyūnus* (with *ē*, dialectal and late, from the original *ae*). The primate (*d*)*yai-* (*d*)*yūno-s* will have meant 'gebunden,' with the connotation of 'fasting, abstaining from,' cf. the

second root *yu* 'fernhalten,' a 'disjoin' that originated with separative prefixes (see *TAPA. XLI. 49*, observing Germ. *au/gebunden* = 'iunctus, disiunctus') but pervaded the (reduplicated) simplex, cf. Skr. *yāvana-m* 'fernhalten,' but also *ayāvana-m* 'nicht-mischung.' The *jen* of Lat. *jajen-taculum* will contain I.E. (*d*)*yem* 'binden,' and *-taculum* might belong with *τάκων* quasi 'tomaculum,' the whole like 'fast-bite,' say; unless **jajento-*, participle of (*d*)*yem-*, has been assimilated to *tomaculum*.

uulua ('locus' in the feminine vocabulary of the Romans = 'uulua'), on the other of 'domus.' If we recognize a *y*-less form of root, *yóni-* is akin to (dial.) Eng. *tewel* 'anus'; see the Oxford Dictionary for the word. From the secret vocabulary of women the form *tewny* 'uulua' has been instanced; cf. ἀμφί-δεα in Hippocrates, if from *d[y]ewā*.

17. The root *dyēw* [with samdhi forms *diw* | *dyu d(y)ew* | (*d*)*yew*] 'distant' (employed in one language of time, in another of space) is to be recognized in Gāthic *divā-mna-* 'fernbleibend': Lat. *diū* 'long.' Without *y* we have the sept of δῆν (see Boisacq s.v.); without *d*, Gāthic *yavd yavaē-* 'semper.' The *y*-less form may be due to dissimilation, e.g. in the I.E. prototype of Indo-Iranian *d[y]ūīya-* 'embassy,' affecting *d[y]ūta-* 'nuntius' (from original 'cinctus' ad iter). In Byzantine Greek ἀπό-ζωστος = 'discharged' (from service).

18. To the root *dyēw* 'lucere' (e.g. in Skr. *dyāu-* and *di-dyū-*) we may likewise refer the ritual words *yāva-* *yāvan*¹ ('light half of lunar month' (cf. *Iuno* Lucina), noting *d[y]ū-yana-* 'glut, hitze am körper.'

19. Latin *ge-*: Skr. *ya-* (I.E. *ye-*, not *ze*, cf. § 10). I here recur to my thesis that Latin *ge-* = I.E. *ye-*. Negatively, the only counter-instance is found in *iecur* (not **gecur* because of the following *c*). Positively, within our historical ken, in Germ. *gāten gāhren gischt* (the two last with certain I.E. *y-*) the initial *y-*, followed by a palatal sound, has yielded a *g-*; and in the Latin glosses (see Goetz, s.v. *uerbena*) *iepo-* has yielded *giro-* | *geru-*, though I will suppose the *g-* to be Italianate, rather than hard Latin *g-*. For the interpretation of Greek γ from *y* see G. Meyer, *Gram.*³ § 218.

20. To the root [*d*] *yem-* in the sense of 'binding' (§§ 3, 24) I of course referred Lat. *geminī* 'twins': Celtic *yemno-*, Skr. *yamā(v)*, an identification so probable *a priori* that it can only be given up when shown to bring us to a phonetic *impasse*. To the same root *yem* I referred *gemoniae* 'stocks' (for exposure of executed criminals, cf. § 4): Skr. *yan-trā-* 'schränke' (? or with the sense of 'raising,' cf. § 7); *gemiones* 'maceriae' (enclosures); *gemina* 'peristromata'; *geminiscus* καρπό-δεσμος, 'ligatura brachiorum febricitantibus.'² To the sense of 'raising' I also referred *gemūt* 'sighs' (heaves a sigh, etc.), comparing Eng. *heaves* 'panting respiration of a porsy horse.'

21. To the root *yes* in the sense of 'raises,' derived from 'heaves' (whence also 'lifts,' §§ 7, 24), I referred *gerit* 'bears, carries, takes' (cf. Av. *ā+yam* 'herbeibringen, holen'); note Lat. *tollit* : *tulit*, but *bellum gerit* may derive from *bellum iungit*. The sense of 'raising' comes out in *congestus* 'agger, acervus,' *suggestus* 'platform.' For the special shading of 'vomits' (= heaves) cf. Ovid, *Met.* VI. 664, 'pectore diras egerere . . . dapes . . . gestit,' and see also Lewis and Short, s.v. *uomitūs*, 1. For a usage of *geritur* entirely conformable to Av. *yāh- ākμῆ* (§ 7) cf. Plautus, *Mil.* 1150:

¹ It would be interesting to know whether *āyāva-* / *āyāvan-* 'month' (TS.) began as a design-

nation of the dark half of the month.

² So Marstrand, *Ériu* V. 160. EDD. C. Q.

non tu scis, quom ex alto puteo sursum ad summum escenderis,
maximum periculum inde esse ab summo ne rusum cadas ?
nunc haec res apud summum puteum geritur.

Here the context suggests that *geritur* = *decernitur*. In *Yt.* 13, 41 *kahmāicit yāṇham jāso kahmāicit qzaghām biwivā* . . . (=quotiens ad summum [ἀκμήν, entscheidung] uenit, quotiens angustias timuit . . .) the notion of the 'crisis' lies in the noun *yāṇham*, but *ai ākmaī* of the crisis of an illness shows what the original sense of Av. *yāh-* might have been.

22. I also derived *gemma* 'rising, swelling, protuberance,' whence 'bud'—cf. *Priapea*, 61, 6, *gemmas germinē exeuntes*—from **gesma* (noting the gloss *gisma* 'anulus'); and *germen* from **gesimen*; and after examining all the other derivations these primates still seem to me the most convincing.¹ I further thought that *gerrae* 'foamings, frothings, nonsense' might be from **geserae*.

23. As for *gestit*, which I defined by *feruet* (boils to, burns to), I would now compare it more directly with the derivatives of Skr. *yas* grouped in § 6 (cf. § 15, 'studet'). In our English *longing* we have the same physiological note of stretching out to secure a thing (Skr. *yāsyati* 'sich anstrengen'). Possibly, however, *gestit* 'longs for' belongs more nearly with Skr. *yācati* 'precatur, rogat, petit': Av. *yās-* (s from *k̂* in Bartholomae; but the conjugation-stem *yāsa-* is from *yā[k̂]sk̂e-*, inchoative to Skr. *yāc*) 'desiderare, petere.' In that case it stands for **gēkstio-* (*gestio* like *Sestius*). Yet, so far as the noun *gestus* 'port, carriage' has not affected its senses, *gestio* is better defined by 'sich anstrengt' (studet) or by 'feruet.'

24. Walde, however, refuses the equation of *yamā-*: *geminus* in favour of *aemulus*: *yamā-*, though even if we could grant a root *ayem* 'like,' there is still no reason why *geminus* might not go with its reduced form *yem*. But *ayem-* is a construction whose validity is exhausted with *aemulus*. It is confirmed by nothing but what it is assumed to explain. This *ayem-* has to be defined by 'similis,' but what if Skr. *yamā-* = *iunctus*? This it seems certainly to do. From 'uincire' we get all the chief senses of *yam*, without forcing any note (see e.g. on 'donare' § 8). In the Avesta *yam* is generalized to something like 'ἐχευ' or 'capere,' comparable with *apisci*: *apere* or with *uincere*: *uincire*

¹ The separation of Gothic *hazjan* 'laudare' from Skr. *śasya-* 'laudandus,' *śasya-m* 'laus,' is entirely inadmissible; and after Varro's testimony to *Casmenae* / *Camēnae* (quare e *Casmena* *Carmina carmina carmen*, R extrito *Camēna factum*, L.L. VII. 27-28) we cannot refuse to admit *hās* 'laudare' into Latin (cf. Fest.-Paul., 38, 12, Lindsay, *Camēnae* . . . quod canunt antiquorum laudes), as the sort of word-element we call a root. Nor can we lightly put aside Varro's feeling of kinship between *carmen* and *Casmenae*. True, we now know how to mediate between Skr. *śasman* 'laus' and *carmen* (*Casmena*), as Varro did not, viz. by assuming a doublet *hāsimon-* / *hāsmen* (like Lat. *tegimen* / *teg-*

men; Sanskrit examples in Macdonnell, *Ved. Gram.*, § 165), and from these primates to bring Varro's report of facts into accord with the strictest phonetics. No predilection for **canmen* ('dissimilated' to *carmen*), nor for the grouping of *carmen* with *κάρνυξ* (a derivation Varro was as capable of suggesting as any modern), can justify itself against Varro's combination of *Ca(s)menae* with *carmen* ('elogium, laus' in sepulchral inscriptions, v. *Thes. L.L.* III. 465, 74; cf. Skr. *uktha-śās-* 'uersus-recitans'). The root *hās-* may well = Skr. *śas* (: Lat. *castrat*), and have started as 'cut,' applied to engraved sepulchral pictures (pictorial writing), serving as notes and text for a recurring *laudatio* or *elogium*.

(cf. § 15 on *yu* = 'adipisci'). In view of the parallelism of Skr. *yam* with *yu* (cf. § 1), it is not open to doubt that Indo-Iranian *yam* meant 'to do what one does with a strap or thong; e.g., to drive; to raise and lift; to strap up and carry off,' cf. *yāma* - 'rein, driver'; nor is *yantra* - 'uinculum' to be questioned in *dāça-yantra* - (RV.) 'decem uincula habens.' Further verisimilitude for *yam* 'uincire' is furnished by the parallel I.E. root *dem* (§ 32), that is *dyem* / *yem* | *dem*.

25. This brings us to examine again, after Walter and Bugge (KZ. XII. 406, XIX. 423), the relation of *δίδυμος* to *geminus*. Because of *τρίδυμος*, and more particularly of *ἄμφι-δυμος* (*Odyssey*), it is attractive to derive *-δυμος* from *d(y)u* 'iungere,' if not from *d(y)um*, parallel with *d(y)em*. In the *Odyssey* context we excellently interpret *ἄμφιδυμοί* (of harbors) by 'circum-uincti' (land-locked) as being suitable for the ambush there instituted — a Virgilian *secessus* of a harbor (*Aen.* I. 159 sq.). In the Gallic proper name *Ver-ingodumnus* the posterius would seem to mean 'iugi-uinciens.'

26. I have elsewhere argued at length (*AJPh.* XXV. 171) that Lat. *aemulus* did not start as 'suchend gleich zu kommen,' but from 'persequens, sectator.' Examples of the synonymic grouping of *aemulor* with *sequor* can be multiplied by turning up the *Thesaurus*, s.v.: thus, *aemulantur* . . . 'imitatur ac sequitur' (974, I, cf. 74); *sectam aem.* (quasi fig. etym. 974, 8), *aem.* — 'adsequi' (ib. 15), *aem.* — 'instare uestigiis' (18), *sequitur aemulaturque* (59, cf. 82). Nonius defined *aemulus* by 'sectator uel imitator' (976, 52); cf. 976, 27, where *aemulus* suggests 'secundus' (prope sequens), as it does in *Aen.* V. 187, 'partem <navis> rostro premit *aemula* Pristis.' Per contra, Lewis (*Elem. Lat. Dict.*) renders *consector* and *consequor* (also *persequor*) by 'imitates.'¹

27. The root to which I have referred *aemulus* (*IF.* XXVI. 27) had a weak stage is ('chercher,' so Boisacq, s.v. *ἱμερος*), but also a stage *ais* (e.g. in Arm. *aic*, see Brugmann, *Kvg.* § 138). The definitions I have given it range from 'captare / *captiare' on the one hand to 'capere' on the other, a range of meaning Boisacq (25²) seems disposed to challenge. Well, if we want evidence, we may consider *consequor*, which means 1st 'sequor,' 2nd 'adipiscor.' So does Low Latin **captiare*, cf. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, p. 129: 'catch and chase are respectively from ONF. *cachier* and OF. *chacier* (now *chasser*), both from LL. **captiare* . . . ; the gen. sense of *catch* (*take*, not *pursue*) is exclusively English, the original meanings (still in the Romance languages) having been taken by the later adoption *chase*.' Add to this group Ital. *cattare* 'zu erlangen suchen, trachten' (i.e. 'desiderare, *ἱμεῖν*') and *accatare* 'andar raccogliendo elemosine, mendicare,' from LL. *captare*. Further note Skr. *van* = 'verlangen' (desiderare) but also 'erlangen' (capere), Av. *van* 'wünschen; gewinnen' (Bartholomae, s.vv. 3 *van* and 2 *van*): Lat. *uenari* 'to chase' (after Meillet).

28. The survival of the root *ais* 'capere, captare' in Latin is put beyond

¹ In KZ. XLV. 115, I have shown that *im-* taken as a pronominal adverb = 'item'; while in *imitor* and Irish *imh-ais* 'coaeuus' is best *imāgo* 'wax-bust' is cognate with *ἔκ-μαρμα*.

question by *aeruscatores* ap. Gellium, XIV. 1, 2: 'id praestigiarum atque officiarum genus commentos esse aeruscatores et¹ cibum quaestumque ex mendaciis captantes.' According to this passage *aeruscatores* means precisely 'accatere.' It is based on a stem **ais-us-* 'captans,' like Skr. *van-ús-* 'cupidus,' extended by the diminutive suffix to *aisus-ko-*, describing a wheedling sort of seeker (cf. *αἰμύλος*, below). Oscan *Vezkef*, interpreted as Lat. *Vetusco*, apart, we have *corusco-* 'dartling,' diminutive to **corus-* 'darting' (: Skr. *śáru-* 'dart,' cf. *caśśús-* 'eyeing': *cáśśu-* 'eye').²

29. There is not space here to go into all the list of Greek derivatives from *ais* that Boisacq (l.s.c.) has waved aside with a jaunty 'arbitrairement,' as though Skutsch had not protested that all etymologies (I would say derivations from roots) are arbitrary. As regards *αἰσθάνομαι* (not to *ob-oedio*,³ see *Bull. Univ. Texas*, No. 263, § 38¹), which I defined by 'accipio'—cf. *capio* = 'uideo,' etc. (*Thes. L.L.* III. 321, 11), and *accipio* = audio, etc. (*ib.* I. 306, 45)—especially note Av. *aēš* 'auditorio' (Bartholomae, p. 29, 4). As regards *αἰρέω*, Brugmann's recent explanation (*IF.* XXXII. 5) from Skr. *sisarti* 'eilt, läuft nach, strömt, jagt nach, verfolgt' is identical semantically with mine from *ais*. The connection of *αἰρεῖ* with the chase is clearly set down in the lexica and Homeric *αἴμονα θήρης* = 'sectantem ferarum' (*IF.* XXVI. 27 sq.), an interpretation strongly confirmed by Plato, *Legg.* 823 E, where (θήρας) *αἰμύλος ἔρως* = '(ferarum) sectatio' is a periphrasis for the abstract of *αἰμύλος*; cf. just before in the context *ἄγρας* . . . *ἕμερος* (= 'ferarum cupido'). But *αἰρεῖ* also means 'seduces, entraps,' and so does *αἰμύλος*, 'taking, captivating.' Add *αἰμός* 'δρυμός,' i.e. 'chase' (I conjecture), cf. Skr. *ván(a-)* 'wood': Av. *van*, *uenari* above. Truly a root *ais-* 'chercher,' specialized as 'sectari, uenari' does good service in Greek Etymology, and is indeed little more specialized than Av. *aēš* 'Jemand (Akk.) angehen (in feindlichem sinn), angreifen, nachstellen' (Bartholomae, 29. 6). The connection of our words (at least of *αἰρέω*) with the chase is further shown by the synonymous dialect verb *ἀγρεῖν* (see e.g. Brugmann, *IF.* XXXII. 4). Phonetically, if the spiritus asper of *αἰρέω* does not come from *-h₂p-* (out of *-σ₂p-*), it may have been picked up from the aorist *εἶλον*. The failure of the aspiration to appear in *αὔριον* (pleaded by Brugmann-Thumb, *Gram.*⁴ § 111, anm. 1) may be due to deaspiration in the phrase *ἡ αὔριον* 'crastinus dies'; but the presence of the aspiration in *ἕμερος*, whether due to *hm* or not, fadges with the aspiration of *αἴμων* and *αἰμύλος*, and *ἕμερος* cannot be separated from lexical Skr. *īśma-* 'Cupido.' As regards *αἰσάλων* 'hawk' (of considerable strength, see ap. L. Meyer, II. 94), I find it tautological, containing *ais* 'to catch' + *-σαλων*: *ελεῖν* and *ελωρ*; note the suppletive correlation of *αἰ[-σ]ρέω* with *εἶλον*.

30. To the root *ais* / *is* in the sense of 'bitten, beten' (see e.g. Bartholomae, *Wbch.* 29, 5) I refer *αἰσακος* (ὁ τῆς δάφνης κλάδος, ὃν κατέχοντες ὕμνου

¹ This is the *et* of apposition or definition, v. exx. in *Class. Phil.* VIII. 305.

² Note Lat. *genus* (denied genuine antiquity by Brugmann, *Gr.* II. 1, § 408) for *genu*,—unless *-us*

is from *-os* (see *AJPh.* XXXIV., p. 20, § 51).

³ The postulates for this cognation stand apart phonetically, and violate all probability.

τοὺς θεούς), compounded of *aís-* 'bitt-' + *sakos* 'zweig' (: *sek* 'to cut'; *a* as in Lat. *sacena* 'knife'; sense as in O. Bulg. *socha*, see Walde s.v. *seco*). Here belongs Umbr. *esono-* 'sacrum': τὰ ἱερά. Note the following Sanskrit parallels to words treated in the foregoing sections: with *aís-θάνομαι* cf. *prati* + 3. *iṣ*, 'annehmen (worte, ein befehl), achten auf.' With *aís* 'sequi, sectari, uenari' cf. *eṣate* 'sucht' (PW.², s.v. 1. *iṣ* 7), *pari* + *iṣ* 'herumsuchen nach'; *eṣyāmi* (AV. VII. 60, 7) 'sequar'; 3. *iṣ* 4, c, 'petere a'; *prati* + *iṣ* 'auffangen in' (loc.); *prāṭṣam icchati* 'sucht aufzutreiben wie ein Wild,' a ritual formula strongly attesting the connection of the root with the chase. Note αἰσθησις in huntsman's language = 'sign' (of game). In *api* + *iṣ* (RV. IX. 69, 1) 'nachstreben, nachzukommen suchen,' and in *abhi* + *iṣ* 'erstreben,' the sense of *aemulari* is strongly suggested.

31. To return from this digression and to give further evidence for Lat. *ge-* from I.E. *ye*:

(a) *sug-gillat* 'bruises, gives a black eye to' (but in Petronius, 128, 2, *suggillare* = 'tumefacere, augere'). The primate will have been *sub-yeslo-* 'sub-tumor' (cf. on *yes* in § 7). In quadrisyllabic forms like *suggilláuit* we should expect, by the 'law of *conscriptillo*' (cf. Friedrich on Catullus, XXVI. 4; Fay, *AJPh.* XXXI. 33; *IF.* XXVI. 32), **suggiláuit*: pres. **suggello*. The conflict ended in *suggillo*.

(b) *Gello* | *gillo* 'sheaf of grain' (or the like): note the glosses *culmo* · *gillone* seu *spica*, *culmis* · *gellonibus*, *segetes* · *gellones* (messes), *segetes* · *caelionis*. For the sense of 'sheaf' see on *ζειά*, § 13; for 'top,' § 7. There is another *gello* in the glosses *gellonem* · *baucalem* and *aqualegellae* · *ποδόκοιλον* (i.e., after Ducange, *aquale* · *gello*, *ποδόκοιλον*). The *baucalis* was a narrow-necked bellying water-jar (*ποδόκοιλον*), and it is interesting to note that *aqualiculus* got to be the name of the paunch of the pot-bellied man. The use of the *gillo* to hold snow-water (see Riese, *Anth. Lat.* nos. 117, 136) has caused the word to be connected with *gelu* 'ice,' whereas its protuberance should rather make us connect it with *sug-gillat*.

32. Further cognates of the *dy-* roots (§§ 15-16): Skr. *yādamāna-* 'coniunctissimus.' The examples in RV. are III. 36, 1, *ātibhis y.* = 'auxiliis coniunctus' (i.e. 'praeditus'); III. 36, 7, *sámudreṇa sándhavo y.* = 'cum mari fluuii c.'; VI. 19, 5, the same with loc. *sámudre*; VII. 69, 3, *rátho vādhvā y.* = 'currus cum coniuge' (? or cum iumento, cf. *vadhūmant-*) c.; VII. 76, 5, *ámardhanto vásubhir y.* = 'innocentes bonis c.' I find in *yādamāna-* a compound of **yās-* 'cingulum' (: *ζωστήρ*) + a participle *damāna-* (? for *da[ma]māna-*) cognate with *-δεμνον* in *κρή-δεμνον*: O. Ir. *damnaim* 'I fasten, bind,' to a root *d[y]em* (§ 20), possibly found in Lat. *re-dimio*. In view of the correlation of 'bind' with 'punish' (§ 4), it may be asked whether the *a* of *δάμνημι* 'I yoke, subdue' is not to be identified with the *a* of Lat. *damnat* 'punishes.' From a root *dyā-m-*, whose *ā* need not conflict with *e/o* vocalism (§ 9), *ζημία* and *damnatio* (but not *damnosus* 'extravagant') may be derived, also *δάμος* 'pagus.' *Dammum* 'poena, multa' might be deverbative, from

damnat, but may be a syncope form, corresponding to Skr. (ni-) *yāmana-* 'das bändigen, bezwingen'; cf. *damá-s* 'poena.'

33. Skr. *yādas-* 'fluid, semen,' *yādura-* 'semen copiose dans (effundens).' These native definitions are certainly right in substance, and our words are compounds of I.E. *yō[u]s-* 'iūs' (soup) + *dos* 'dans' ('datum'), as found in Skr. *dravino-das* (voc.) 'opi-dans,' cf. also *reto-dhā-* / *°dhas-* 'semen faciens.' As posteriora *dā* and *dhā* are not substantially different in Sanskrit, vid. e.g. the word-list in Grassmann's *Wbch.*, p. 1687, taking as specimens *rayidā-* 'rem-dans' and *ratna-dhā* 'opem-dans.' Cognate with Skr. *yādas-* we have in Greek,

34. *ζῷ-θος-* 'beer,' a viscous, foamy liquor drunk in Egypt and named by the Greeks there resident—at least no evidence of Egyptian nomenclature has been adduced—something like 'foam-giver.' In *ζῷ[σ]-θος-* note the *u-* color, as in Lat. *ius* 'soup.'

35. Skr. *yā[s]-das-*, a sea-monster. If this creature was a giant squid (devil-fish, octopus) his name is aptly interpreted by 'ius-effundens,' cf. *squid* 'squirter,' O. Eng. *wase-scite* 'ooze-discharger,' and Lat. *lol-ligo* (KZ. XLV. 125); O. Eng. *cudele* 'cuttle (fish)'; Lat. *gutta* 'drop,' *guttus* 'dropping bottle' (?).

36. *ζω-ρός* 'strong' (especially of wine). As Eng. *strong* is cognate with *string*, so *ζωρός* (from **<d>yōs-ro-*) may belong with *ζωστήρ* 'cingulum.' Cf. in Latin 'Lyaeo *uincire*' (Propertius), 'uino *domitus*' (Ennius).

37. Skr. *dāsa-* 'demon' may be united with *vi-yāsā-* (§ 4) on the hypothesis of a root *dya*s* 'uincire,' and *dāsā-* 'demon' (but with passive sense, 'slave') with the *δοῦλος* group: **<d>yōus* 'uincire.'

38. Lat. *pariēs* 'ambitus' (muri). With Skr. *pari-* + *yat* 'umstellen, umringen' before our eyes, we can scarcely call in question the derivation of *pariet-* from **pr̥ri-ya*t-*, cf. Vedic *saṁ-yāt-* (adj.) 'continuous.' Against Sommer's Lat. *p-* from *tv-* see *AJPh.* XXXIII, 386, fn. 3, and Persson, *Beitr.* 476.

39. Lat. *ariēs* is also compounded from *ari* + *ya*t-*, cf. *-yāt-* 'petens' in § 4. The military uses of *κρίος* and *aries* certainly justify us in deriving the name *aries* from 'butting' or 'attacking.' Plautus has *umerus* (sc. *est*) *aries* (*Capt.* 786), *aries incursans* (cf. *Bacch.* 341; Pliny, *N.H.* IX. 99) *aries icens* (cf. *Cas.* 849), cf. *petulcus* in Columella VII. 3, 5. The simplest analysis of *ariet-*, Umbr. *eriet-*, would be to find in *ari-* / *eri-* (cf. O. Bulg. *jaro-*, prius in proper names) the prefix meaning 'very' (*ἀρι-* / *ἐρι-*), but because of *ἐρι-φος* 'kid' (which might, to be sure, mean 'very-butting,' with *-φο-*: *bhēy* in O. Bulg. *biti* 'schlagen') and Lith. *éras* 'lamb' (which could scarcely be a discomposit hypocoristic form) I would see in *eri-* *ἐρι-* (on the phonetics of Lat. *ari-* see Persson, l.s.c. 143 fn. 5) a derivative of the root found (extended by determinatives) in *ἐρείδω* 'ferit' (*ἐρείδει πλεγγήν*; note *δ* in *ἐρι-δ-* 'strife,' but acc. *ἐριν*), *ἐρείκει* 'rends' (see Persson, l.s.c. 836 sq.; 839 sq. for a 'basis' *eri-*, with the senses 'reissen, stossen,' e.g., in Skr. *ṛṣāti*). Forms like *ἐρι-φος* and *ari-yet-* would have been tautological= something like 'urge-feriens.' From

such tautological groups the prefix *eri-* was generalized in the sense of Lat. *per-*.

40. Lat. *abies*. No particular readjustment of definition has to be made if in place of my analysis as *abi-et-* (C.Q. III. 276) we posit *abi-yet-* 'aquam-petens.' 'Water-seeker' is a fair description of a tree predestined for shipbuilding. Note Livy XXVIII. 45, 15, '*abietem* in fabricandas naues,' Pliny N.H. XVI. 41, '*expetita* nauigiis.' But I insist, above all, on one of my former examples, *casus abies uisura marinos* (Virgil, G. II. 68), and even venture to believe that for Virgil the sense of *abi* in *abies* may have been refreshed by the Celtic associations of his youth. Scholars in their libraries may fancy that 'aquam (flumen) petens' is a vague, or fanciful, designation of the fir; but to timber-getters, sliding their logs down hillsides to the water's edge (a literary motif, almost, in Catullus, C. 4), there to be shaped into boats, this designation may have seemed trite and even prosaic. So Hupa *talkait* 'fishing-board' means 'over the water it has been pushed' (cf. *Hdbk. Am.-Ind. Lang.*, p. 109) and the Chinook word for 'mink,' *é galelx* = 'he runs into the water' (*ib.* 80; 617). What seems vague to one of us may be very clear to the proper user of a word. If I write *increaser* it may set my readers to guessing, but in a plumber's shop it most definitely suggests a precise kind of pipe-joint, and to the lamp-dealer another sort of joint. As to form, the posterius *-(y)et-* will be from *-yet-*, whence nom. **abyess* (not *abiēs*).

41. But the word *tannen-äpfel* raises the question whether, as Fick-Stokes⁴ suggest (p. 11), *abies* contains a cognate of *apple* (European primate *abi-*, perhaps a diminutive, see Schrader, *Reallex.* p. 43; but cf. Serb-Croatian *jābukā* in Berneker, *Slav. Etym. Wbch.* p. 22). Observe the gloss *ἄβιν · ἐλάτην*, *οἱ δὲ πεύκην* (cf. Eng. apple = apple-tree), not certainly of Greek origin; also *ἄβα · τροχός* (= 'wheel,' but also 'pill, ball'; cf. *τροχίσκος* 'ball, lozenge'), possibly cognate with Lat. *bāca* 'berry.' Further we have Skr. *āba-yu-* (plant mentioned in AV. VI. 16, 1); and the corrupt reading of Pliny, N.H. XVIII. 53, *offa. milio* (in one MS. *ob familiae*) which, if *obba* 'millet-head' were elsewhere of record, would certainly be resolved in favour of *obba*, instead of <ph>*oba*. We do have *obba* (? hypochoristic for *ōba*) of a bellying vase or decanter, possibly allusive to some pear-shaped fruit or nut (observe that it is *nux Abellana* that we have of record, rather than *mālum A.*), cf. *bacar* 'trulla' (a ladle). Then *ὄβρια* 'young' (of animals) might be akin (cf. *fruit*, Germ. *frucht* for 'child'). If the above words justify us in positing a European primate *abi-* 'malum, nux,' then in *abi-(y)et-* the posterius is derived from the root *yē* in Lat. *iacio*: *ἵημι*; and *abi-yet-* may be illustrated by *iacere poma* 'to bear fruit' (Ovid A.A. I. 747).

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

[FOR copies of the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* and *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* this Journal is indebted to the publishers, O. R. Reisland of Leipzig and the Weidmannsche Buchhandlung respectively; for the material upon which the summaries of other German and Austrian periodicals are based to correspondents in Holland, Switzerland, and the United States of America.]

American Journal of Philology. Vol. XXXV. No. 3. 1914.

E. W. Fay, *Varroniana. De Lingua Latina*. On Books VI, VII. Continuation and conclusion of the author's curt critical and linguistic notes. Charles Knapp, *Studies in the Syntax of Early Latin*. A detailed review of the substance of C. E. Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin*, vol. 2, *The Cases*. B. O. Foster, *The Duration of the Trojan War*. Van Leeuwen's theory that the events of the *Iliad* are conceived as taking place, not in the tenth year of the war, but soon after the arrival of the Greeks, is set out and supported by the consideration that there is apparently no allusion in the *Iliad* to any foray in Trojan territory, except the 'Great Foray' which Leaf in his *Troy* (1912) has reconstructed from scattered allusions in Homer. There is no stress to be laid on the numbers given in *Il.* 9. 323 sqq. for the cities taken by Achilles, as the account is rhetorical and the numbers are 'round.' J. A. Scott, *Two Homeric Personages*. Hesiod and Pindar give no countenance to the fancy of Bethe that Hector was a Theban hero (*Il.* 4. 86 sqq., 5. 95 sqq., 165 sqq.). None of the three scenes in which Pandarus appears in the *Iliad* can stand alone. The first and second scenes must have some conclusion, viz. that the traitor must pay for his treason. The third scene presupposes that the archer has failed more than once with his bow, and that he has been responsible for some deed of unusual importance. A. C. Johnson, *The Date of Menander's Andria*. This is fixed as twelve years after the four years' war of 307-304 between Athens and Cassander, when Attica was invaded, i.e. 295-293.

Vol. XXXV. No. 4. 1914.

E. G. Sihler, *Caesar, Cicero and Ferrero*. A vigorous protest against the methods pursued by the popular Italian historian of Rome. His history is that of a clever journalist infected with a desire to judge the ancient world from the modern standpoint exclusively, and to apply crudely materialistic and sociological theories as though they furnished complete explanations of historical evolution. F.'s presentations are painfully inadequate in many details. H. Martin, *Spanish Inscriptions; Additional Comment*. Notes on forms and vocabulary from the Inscriptions in *C. I. L.* II, *Ephem. Epigr.* 8 and 9, and Hübner's volume of Christian Inscriptions in Spain. H. L. Wilson (deceased) and R. van Deman Magoffin, *Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University*. VIII, Transcripts, with notes, of twenty-nine inscriptions. W. A. Heidel, *Aristarchus of Samos*. Corrections of details in Sir T. L. Heath's recent work. C. W. E. Miller, '*ne extra oleas*.' Draws attention to the appearance of this proverbial expression (which is a translation of *ἐκτὸς τῶν ἐλαίων* Ar. *Ran.* 995) as an Elzevir motto from 1642 onwards.

Athenaeum (Pavia). Vol. II. No. 4. 1914.

C. Pascal sets side by side an anonymous epigram quoted by a scholiast on Horace *Satires* II. 2, 50, beginning 'Ciconiarum iste conditor,' and a line of Juvenal's in *Satire* I. 116. In the scholiast's explanation of the epigram, P. would insert 'post' before 'praetura,' thus making the 'praetorius' of Horace's line less questionable. This passage with its scholion may have been in Juvenal's mind as he wrote 'quaeque salutato crepitat Concordia nido,' the stork being a symbol of 'pietas' in antiquity; hence he criticizes the interpretation of old scholars, who identify *Concordia* with the stork; and approves that of Duff, who explains that as passers saluted the temple with prayer, the noise of the storks seemed to be the answer of the goddess. P. adds that the allusion would be familiar to Romans, to whom the discordant noise on the temple of Concord would be a well-known jest.

Vol. III. No. 1. 1915.

B. Inzerillo, *Signs* (sigla) and critical annotations in antiquity (with reference to a passage in Suetonius), discusses a passage from *De Viris illustribus*: 'Multaque exemplaria contracta emendare et distinguere ac adnotare (Probus) curavit.' According to Steup the existence of a second grammarian Probus depends on the meaning attached to *emendare*, *distinguere*, and *adnotare*, Steup holding the view that *adnotare* means to add critical signs such as are found in the part of Suetonius contained in the *Anecdota Parisina*, whereas Gellius refers to annotations (in the modern sense) by a Probus whom Steup therefore has to degrade into a nephew of the other! The meanings of the three verbs are discussed at length, and the conclusion is reached that the first two include the placing of critical marks, while *adnotare* is 'to comment.'

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1914.

Aug. 1. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense, *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, rec. C. W. et O. H. Vol. V. Anthologii libri quarti partem alteram continens (Lortzing). The edition will be complete when the Index nominum and Index verborum to Vols. III. and IV. are published. G. Cereteli et S. Sobolevski, *Exempla codicum graecorum*. Vol. II. Cod. Petropolitani (Gardthausen). Specimens of dated minuscule MSS. J. Déchelette, *Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique celtique et galloromaine*. II. Archéologie celtique ou protohistorique. II. partie: Premier âge du fer ou époque de Hallstatt (Anthes). Has the same merits as the earlier parts. G. Herbig, *Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen* (Jacobsohn). A long review sketching the contents.

Aug. 8. H. Meusel, *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de bello Gallico*, erkl. von F. Kraner u. W. Dittenberger; 17te vollständig umgearbeitete Aufl. von H. M. (Klotz). Praises the edition highly, and discusses at length some points on which he differs from M.

Aug. 15. H. Mayer, *Prodikos von Keos und die Anfänge der Synonymik bei den Griechen*. Rhetorische Studien, hrsg. von E. Drerup. 1. Heft (Nestle). K. Link, *De antiquissimis veterum quae ad Iesum Nazarenum spectant testimoniis*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, XIV. Band, 1. Heft (Ed. Wolff). A careful examination of the passages in Josephus, Pliny, Suet., Tac., and a valuable sketch of most of the recent work on the subject. J. M. Hoogvliet, *Die sog. 'Geschlechter' im Indo-Europäischen und im Latein* (Meltzer). Stimulating but very speculative.

Aug. 29 (double number). W. Kiaulehn, *De scaenico dialogorum apparatu* (Immisch). On the setting of the dialogue from Plato to Augustine and later. Ed. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*; Ad. Harnack, *Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte?* (Wünsch). Gualterus Nieschmidt, *Quatenus in scriptura Romani litteris Graecis usi sint* (Brandt). N. has examined the MS. evidence for Pl., Lucil.,

some of Cic.'s letters and philosophical writings, Sen.'s letters, Lact. He concludes that in the writing of passages of any length Greek letters were used. In the writing of single words there was great irregularity, even in the same author. F. Cramer, *Römisch-germanische Studien* (G. Wolff). Twenty-six papers (some published before) chiefly on the Lower Rhine. W. Petersen, *The Greek diminutive Suffix -ισκο- -ισκη-* (Hermann). Highly praised. E. Hoppe, *Mathematik und Astronomie im klassischen Altertum* (M. C. P. Schmidt). The reviewer finds many faults, but recommends the book as stimulating and instructive.

Sept. 5. F. W. Westaway, *Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin* (Meltzer). The book contains much valuable independent work. It is specially strong in Phonetics.

Sept. 12. C. H. Haile, *The Clown in Greek Literature after Aristophanes* (W. Süss). Traces the figure of the *βωμόλοχος* in the New Comedy and in Plautus. P. Rasi, *Bibliografia Virgiliana* (1910-1911) (P. Jahn). Notices of 148 productions. Otto Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*. II. (J. Bick). *Papers of the British School at Rome*. VI. (1913) (E. Anthes). Deals with megalithic buildings in Malta and Greece, etc. The illustrations are excellent.

Sept. 19. Fr. Vollmer, (1) *Homerus Latinus*, (2) *Zum Homerus Latinus* (P. Jahn). A work showing endless diligence.

Sept. 26. P. F. Kretschmer, *De iteratis Hesiodicis* (Aly). Deals with repetitions in Hesiod, which are most common in the *Theogony*. H. Buss, *De Bacchylide Homeri imitatore* (E. Eberhard). Based on the practice of the writers of *Epinikia* to introduce mythological matter into their poems. K. Ohlert, *Rätsel und Rätselspiele der alten Griechen*; W. Schultz, *Rätsel aus dem hellenischen Kulturkreise* (Tittel). The first book is a great storehouse of riddle texts. The comment brings out the great importance of riddle-guessing in Greek social life. Schultz's object is to use the riddles as a step to the reconstruction of ancient myths. K. Dziatzko, *Ausgewählte Komödien des Terentius*. I. Phormio (J. Köhm). Excellent, especially on linguistic questions. †H. Lattermann, killed in action.

Oct. 3. W. Köhler, *Die Verbrechung bei den griechischen Tragikern* (N. Wecklein). G. Beseler, *Beiträge zur Kritik der römischen Rechtsquellen* (Kübler). Too positive and concise. E. Obst, *Der Feldzug des Xerxes* (Kallenberg). E. W. Fay, *Indo-European Flexion was Analytical* (Meltzer). The hypothesis is not capable of demonstration, but is advocated by a thoroughly-equipped scholar who understands scientific method.

Oct. 10. F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Helm). An excellent introduction to the subject for English readers. O. Richter, *Das alte Rom* (†P. Graf-funder). A short guide to the antiquities.

Oct. 17. F. Preisigke, *Griechische Papyri* (P. Viereck). H. Gross, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Tabula Peutingeriana* (W. Nestle). E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script* (Heiberg). A history of the minuscule script used in South Italy from the eighth to the thirteenth century.

Oct. 24. A. Hillebrandt, *Das Gymnasium und seine Berechtigung* (M.). An excellent defence.

Oct. 31. A. Rzach, *Hesiodi carmina* (Ludwich). R. Staehlin, *Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama* (Bucherer). Thorough and convincing. W. L. Friedrich, *Zur Abfassungszeit von Seneca's Werk De Beneficiis*. Traces the political references.

Nov. 7. W. H. Roscher, *Die hippokratische Schrift von der Siebenzahl* (Pfeiffer). P. Sternkopf, *De M. T. Ciceronis Partitionibus oratoriis* (G. Ammon). E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 3rd ed. (Hausrath). The new editor of R.'s book (W. Schmid) adds an appendix, summarizing new discoveries. E. Meyer, *Der Emporkömmling* (J. Mesk). An interesting discussion of the figure of the *νεπρόλουτος* in Greek and Latin literature. H. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos, mit*

Berücksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften (Pfister). Attaches little importance to Stoic influence on the apostle, to which he attributes only the conception *συνειδήσις*.

Nov. 14. W. Windelband, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*. 3 Aufl. von Adolf Bonhöffer (Lortzing). A thorough revision with the approval of the author, greatly increasing the value of the book. Stoicism appears in a much more favourable light than in the earlier editions. R. W. Livingstone, *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us* (W. Nestle). To be warmly welcomed. The best chapter is perhaps that on the Greek 'directness.'

Nov. 21. A. Ludwich, *Die Homerdeuterin Demo* (R. Berndt). Demo lived about the end of the fifth century A.D., and was probably a Christian. The fragments are an interesting example of allegorical interpretation.

Nov. 28. P. Natorp, *Über Platos Ideenlehre* (Raeder). Obscure. H. Ender, *Die erste sicilische Expedition der Karthager* (Swoboda). A successful study. Sylvain Levi, *Mélanges d'Indianisme*, offerts par ses élèves à M. S. L. (H. Jacobsohn). An interesting tribute to the influence of this teacher.

Dec. 5. W. W. Mooney, *The House-Door on the Second Stage* (E. Wüst). Shows that the stage house had only one door. A. Kiessling, *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, erkl. von A. K.; III. Briefe; 4 Aufl. von R. Heinze (H. Röhl). The reviewer discusses numerous passages. R. B. Steele, *Case Usage in Livy*. IV. The Ablative (Kalinka). The writer's inclination to weed out by criticism the less common usages is unfortunate. M. Swindler, *Cretan Elements in the Cult and Ritual of Apollo* (W. Aly). The remarks on Kathartic and Music are much to the point. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*. VII. *Balder the Beautiful* (O. Gruppe). 'F. recognizes that his collections of facts are more valuable than his theories.' H. B. Walters, *Catalogue of the Greek and Roman Lamps in the British Museum* (Blümner). A worthy successor to previous catalogues.

Dec. 12. K. Flower Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (R. Helm). Introduction and notes are excellent. E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*. I. 2, *Die ältesten geschichtlichen Völker und Kulturen bis zum 16ten Jahrh. v. Chr.* 3 Aufl. (Lenschau). Greatly enlarged and altered, especially as to the history of Babylon. G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine* (†R. Weil).

Dec. 19. Max Pohlenz, *Aus Platos Werdezeit* (H. Raeder). Holds that none of the dialogues were written before the death of Socrates, and traces generally their history. †Drs. S. Sudhaus and H. Wegehaupt, killed in action.

Dec. 26. G. Landgraf, *Kommentar zu Cicero's pro S. Roscio*. 2 Aufl. (Th. Stangl). Gives an insight into the historical development of the Latin language.

1915. Jan. 2. H. Mutschmann, *Sexti Empirici Opera*. II. (Nebe). The codex Laur. 85, 19 (N.) is now fully used, and found with Laur. 85, 11 (L) and Paris 1964 (E) sufficient to constitute the text. Joh. Geffcken, *Kaiser Julianus* (Lenschau). The best work on Julian. U. Kahrstedt, *Die Annalistik von Livius XXXI.-XLV.* (Klotz). Not to be trusted. W. Baeye, *De Macedonum sacris* (Wide). A. Riese, *Das rheinische Germanien in den antiken Inschriften* (Anthes). An excellent complement to the author's earlier work. A. Ernout, *Morphologie historique du Latin* (Meltzer). Inspiring to the Latin teacher, and reaching the highest standard.

Jan. 9. Fr. Susemihl, *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. Ed. III. Curavit O. Apelt (Jaeger). The best guide to the text, for which much remains to be done. I. L. Heiberg, *Archimedis opera omnia*, ed. I. L. H. II.; T. L. Heath, *Archimedes' Werke*. Deutsch von F. Kliem (Tittel). Heiberg gives a sound text, and Heath gives recognition to the matter as the work of 'the greatest mathematical genius which the world has seen.' O. Halbauer, *De diatribis Epicteti* (Schenk). Examines the literary character of the 'diatribe,' which is always the work of the scholar, not of the teacher.

Jan. 16. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Seleucides* (A. Bauer). E. Hermann, *Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektschriften* (Schwyzer).

Jan. 23. O. Koennecke, *Bucolici Graeci* (Rannow). The *adnotatio critica* is unsatisfactory. P. Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakedaemonier* (Lenschau). Contains 815 entries. v. Hagen, *Die Indogermanen* (Meltzer). A stimulating essay. J. H. Schmalz, discussion of Brakman's *Miscella altera*.

Feb. 6. O. Apelt, (i) *Platons Dialog Phaidon*, (ii) *Platons Dialog Gorgias*. Translations with notes by O. A. (Ritter). These books deserve almost unqualified praise. A. Trendelenburg, *Pausanias in Olympia*. With a plan of Olympia (Blümner). Pausanias, who thirty years ago was despised even in Berlin circles, finds here a worthy champion. H. Peters, *Die ost-römischen Digestenkommentare* (Kübler). J. Tolkiehn, *Die Lebenszeit des Grammatikers Charisius*. II.

Feb. 20. W. Leaf, *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography* (Cauer). An excellent book. The author has avoided criticism of the composition of the *Odyssey*, and the picture he constructs from the geography is the more convincing. It does not however lead to an unquestioning belief in the unity of the poem. F. Dürrbach, *Inscriptiones Graecae*. XI. 2, ed. F. D. († R. Weil). The texts are now represented in minuscule script. T. Rice Holmes, *C. I. Caesaris commentarii rerum in Gallia gestarum*, A. Hirtii commentarius VIII. (Klotz). Shows the same thoroughness as the editor's previous works. A. Hekler, *Die Bildniskunst der Griechen und Römer* (Herrmann). Portraits treated as historical documents.

Feb. 27. F. W. Schneidewin and A. Nauck, *Sophokles*. I. Aias. 10 ed. by L. Radermacher (Bucherer). The text is now more conservative. R. Graf, *Szenische Untersuchungen zu Menander* (Wüst). Good material. *Papyri Iandanae*. VIII. (Viereck). A. Gercke, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (Jahn). Brilliant, but very speculative.

Classical Philology. Vol. IX. No. 4. 1914.

P. Shorey, *Plato's Laws and the Unity of Plato's Thought*. A plea in favour of the *Laws*. The writer would show (1) that it is a finished and, considering everything, a well-composed treatise, (2) that its slight divergencies from the *Republic* are outweighed by all-pervading correspondences of principle and detail, (3) that by its allusions to methods and ideas in earlier dialectical dialogues and by its explicit solutions of problems dramatically presented in the minor dialogues it is almost a complete compendium of Platonic philosophy, (4) that its stylistic qualities (precision, stately rhythm and religious unction) deserve study in themselves. C. D. Buck, *Is the suffix of βασιλῆα, etc., of Macedonian origin?* The feminine proper names like Φοίνισσα (also perhaps ἀνασσα) are more likely to have been the pattern for the formation. J. J. Schlicher, *The Historical Infinitive*. II. *Its Literary Elaboration*. Deals with its use in Sallust, the *Bellum Africanum*, Horace, Virgil, Livy and Tacitus. Sallust's use shows a great advance in freedom, while Horace's belongs to the earlier period. Virgil's is chiefly remarkable for the large proportion of passives. Livy's use is less individual and more composite than that of his predecessors. Tacitus starts from the Sallustian use, but develops the construction on his own peculiar lines and employs it in the expression of complex ideas. J. A. Scott, *Athenian Interpolations in Homer*. Part II. *External Evidence*. This evidence is negligible. The story about the recension of Pisistratus probably owed its origin to a regulation by which rhapsodists were prohibited from picking out titbits for their recitations and compelled to follow the order of the poems. A. C. Johnson, *Notes on Attic Inscriptions*. Notes and Discussions. J. S. P. Tatlock, *Some Mediaeval Cases of Blood-Rain*. M. E. Deutsch suggests that in Tibullus II 6. 8 we are to understand that the soldier carries a small quantity of water (*leuem—aquam*) in his helmet in a march through a rainless district.

Vol. X. No. 1. 1915.

G. M. Calhoun, *Perjury before Athenian Arbitrators*. Defends the view based on [Dem.] *Phorm.* (34) 19 that there could be no prosecution for perjury before arbitrators. E. T. Merrill, *The Tradition of Pliny's Letters*. The 'nine-book' family of MSS. bears traces of being an early Middle-age recension, while the 'ten-book' family has escaped this revision. A third, the 'eight-book' family, exhibits traces of a true ancient tradition, but one agreeing more often with the 'nine-book' than with the 'ten-book' tradition. The tenth book, the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan, was appended, perhaps in the 7th or 8th century, to a MS. of the least contaminated of the three families. J. P. Postgate, *Observations on Latin Poets*. On Ter. *Andr.* 971-2 *somniat—uigilans* and two passages in Lucretius III. 391-5; the old transposition of 392 and 393 should be accepted, but a comma placed between *semina* and *corporibus*, 894-930; lines 912-918 should be placed at the beginning of the paragraph, before 894. Allen B. West, *The Chronology of the Years 432 and 431 B.C.* Supports by fresh arguments a combination of Busolt's view that the battle of Potidaea was fought in the tenth month before the attack on Plataea, and E. Meyer's that this attack took place on March 5. J. J. Schlicher, *The Historical Infinitive*. III. *Imitation and Decline*. The Alexandrian influence was unfavourable to its use; and, generally speaking, the construction was kept up by archaizing imitation. Lucan has it but seldom. Statius and Valerius Flaccus, following Virgil, more frequently and especially in the last part of the verse. So later Claudian. In prose some of the innovations remained to the end; but its use in subordinate sentences ends with Tacitus. And there is a general decline in the effectiveness and discrimination with which it is used. The article, like the previous ones, comprises a list of the passages in the literature where it occurs. There are Notes, amongst others, on the construction of *προλαμβάνειν* with genitive in Demosthenes (F. E. Robbins), on Soph. *Ant.* 1281—to be read *τί δ'*; *ἔστιν αὖ κακίον ἢ κακῶν ἔτι*; (W. A. Heidel), on the meaning of *biduum* in certain phrases (J. C. Rolfe), and on the sixth Platonic Epistle (P. Shorey).

Classical Weekly (New York).

1914. Dec. 5. C. Rothe, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältniss zur Ilias* (J. A. Scott). 'This book is to be compared with no other than his own *Ilias als Dichtung*, and it fairly eclipses the earlier production. No finer estimate of the genius of Homer has ever been written. . . . Prof. Rothe died June 15, 1914.' F. F. Abbott, *A History and Description of Roman Political Institutions* (C. K.). For this edition the two indices of the second edition were combined and much enlarged. Additions have been made to the bibliographical material. The result is a book at once readable and scholarly and of prime importance in the field with which it deals.'

Dec. 19. Gilbert Murray, *Euripides and his Age* (H. S. Scribner). 'This book should be read by all classical teachers. . . . The last two chapters on the Art of Euripides are perhaps the most useful.' A. Ledl, *Studien zur älteren Athemischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (A. T. Olmstead). 'The most serious defect of the book is a certain provincial ignorance of the non-German secondary literature. . . . For example, L. has incidentally referred to Headlam's article in the fifth volume of the *Classical Review*, but there is no mention of those in the next, though, had he read them, he must certainly have referred to them.' 'The book has many acute suggestions, often however of a most hazardous nature when we consider the scantiness and untrustworthiness of the evidence.'

1915. Jan. 16. J. S. Reid, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire* (J. F. Ferguson). In its present form the work is open to two possible criticisms: as a book for popular reading, it treats of so many unrelated subjects that it is hard to follow, even for those deeply interested in the subject; as a book of reference, the treatment

of many towns is hardly adequate. The book gives evidence of an enormous amount of investigation.'

Jan. 30. J. A. K. Thomson, *Studies in the Odyssey* (A. Shewan). The reviewer discusses at length the question of expurgation, and contends that the evidence produced by Prof. Gilbert Murray and Mr. Thomson as to the prevalence of horrors in the original epic is inadequate. E. G. Sihler, *Cicero of Arpinum* (G. Showerman). 'Unusually hard to read,' but useful for reference. 'Dr. Sihler's abundance of material and his annalistic method make it possible to determine quickly and easily the whereabouts and activities of Cicero and his associates during any given year.'

Feb. 6. A. C. Clark, *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (C. U. Clark). The review sketches contents. 'Prof. Clark is at his best in the subject of prose-rhythm, a science in which he excels.'

Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1914.

Aug. 8. G. Finsler, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung*. I. In opposition to the late Dr. Carl Rothe, and without questioning the poetic unity of the *Odyssey*, the writer contends that it may be based on earlier poems.

Aug. 15. G. Finsler, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung* (concluded).

Aug. 22/29. (The journal for some time appeared fortnightly on account of war difficulties.) S. Marck, *Die platonische Ideenlehre in ihren Motiven* (M. Wundt). M. accepts as a starting-point Natorp's theory that the Ideas are in the first instance of logical value, and proceeds from this to maintain their metaphysical importance. R. Schubert, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit* (Kahrstedt). Severely criticized.

Sept. 5/12. A. Gercke, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (R. Helm). Improbable suggestions as to the relative date of the books.

Oct. 3/10. H. Collitz and O. Hoffmann, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-inschriften* IV. 4, 2 (Kretschmer). E. Obst, *Der Feldzug des Xerxes* (Grosse).

Oct. 17/24. †A. Roemer, *Homerische Aufsätze* (Friedländer),

Oct. 31/Nov. 7. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXIV. (R. Helm).

Nov. 14/21. G. Obens, *Qua aetate Socratis et Socraticorum epistulae, quae dicuntur, scriptae sint* (Mutschmann). The time of Apuleius and Plutarch is suggested.

Nov. 28. B. Schmidt, *De Cornuti Theologiae graecae compendio capita duo* (Pfister). Explains the conciseness of the book as due to its being a school-book: traces the source (as others have done) to Apollodorus' *περὶ θεῶν*. A. Gudeman, *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus*. 2 Aufl. (Ammon). The prolegomena are very valuable; the text is conservative.

Dec. 5. R. Staehlin, *Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama* (W. Aly). †J. Dechelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie préhistorique*. II. *Archéologie celtique ou proto-historique*. These antiquities have never met with so complete and thorough a treatment. The author has fallen in battle as an officer of French Territorials.

Dec. 26. G. Franke, *Quaestiones Agathianae* (Preisendanz). Hardly proves that Agathias was familiar with Polybius.

Hermes. Vol. XLIX. Part 4. 1914.

T. Kehrnhahn, *Anakreon*. (1) Reasons for believing the first fragment to be imperfect. (2) Discussion of the early division of the poems into books. (3) Aeolic forms in Anakreon. H. Dessau, *Vergil und Karthago, Dido und Anna*. The visit of Aeneas to Africa is an invention by Virgil, suggested by the re-establishment of Carthage by the Dictator Caesar and Octavian. The names Anna and Dido are respectively a Phoenician and a Greek name for the reputed foundress of Carthage, which have later become attached to separate persons. H. Silomon, *Untersuchungen zur Quellen-*

geschichte der Kaiser Aurelian bis Constantius. M. Holleaux, Στρατηγὸς ἢ ἀνθύπατος. Used in an inscription by Cn. Cornelius Sisenna, B.C. 112. It means στρατηγὸς (to use the Greek term) ἢ ἀνθύπατος (to use the proper Roman term). St. Brassloff, *Die Rechtsfrage bei der Adoption Hadrians.* Trajan acted in strict accord with the *ius commune* since he was absent from Rome. K. Busche, *Zu Ciceros Philippischen Reden*, would read, I. 21, *ista lege muniri*; I. 31, *quanto metu principes*; I. 33, *num cinium caritatis*; II. 42, *ingenii tingendi*; II. 64, *feruentibusque animis*; II. 68, *violens et feruens*; XII. 24, *collectis ualentissimorum*. P. Lehmann, *Apuleiusfragmente.* Berlin and Hildesheim fragments of the *De herbarnum uirtutibus*. MISZELLEN: W. Gemoll, Emendations of Seneca's *Epp. Mor.* F. Petersen, Fragment 60 of the *Hypsipyle* should be joined on to Fr. 22. 10. G. Wissowa, *Cistiber = δειπνοκρίτης*, i.e. the *cistiberes* were subordinates of the aediles and managed the *epula publica*. J. Kroll, *Horazens sechzehnte Epode und Vergils erste Ekloge.* Virgil was influenced by this epode, probably the earliest of H.'s poems, e.g. *Ecl.* 50 = *Ep.* 16. 61. C. Robert, Emendations: Eur. *Bacch.* 241-2 reads ἐκείνων twice. Pausanias I. 247 Νίκην τε δόντων τεσσάρων πηχῶν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ δόρυ τε ἔχει. Menander Περικειρομένη 86-87 εἰς μυλῶνά σοι δοκεῖ and οὐτοσὶ φερόμενος ἦξειν, the latter being an echo of *Bacch.* 968. Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 213 is a conversation between Perseus and the Chorus, probably from Aeschylus' *Φορκίδες*.

Vol. L. Part 1. 1915.

G. Wissowa, *Die römischen Staatspriestertümer altlateinischer Gemeindekulte.* An examination of the *sacra* of Alba Longa, Cabum, Caenina, Lanuvium, Tusculum, and of the Laurentes Lavinates under Roman rule. O. Viedebant, *Lesbische Bauinschrift.* A translation and commentary on I. G. xii. 2. 11. W. Weber, *Eine Gerichtsverhandlung vor Kaiser Traian.* An examination of the account of the dispute between the Jews and the Alexandrians given in *Pap. Oxy.* x. 1242. The date falls between A.D. 111-113. Contains discussion of the trial of St. Paul and the *Acts of Paul*. W. Kranz, *Die Irrfahrten des Odysseus.* An attempt to trace the influence of the legend of the Argo upon the *Odyssey*. I. Hammer-Jensen, *Das sogenannte iv Buch der Meteorologie des Aristoteles.* This is a youthful work by Straton. The true fourth book, the *μονόβιβλος περὶ μετᾶλλων*, is to be found in the Arabic *Cosmography* of Kazwini. J. Kroll, *Poseidonios und Vergil's vierte Ekloge.* A reply to Geffcken's article in *Hermes*, xlix. 321. K. Praechter, *Eine Demokritspur bei Xenophon.* Would refer *Oeconomicus* 19. 17 to the authority of Democritus. MISZELLEN: Ed. Meyer, *Die Götter Rediculus und Tutanus.* O. Kern, in a Delphic inscription (p. 177, No. 33 e Rehm), would read οἰκοφύλαξι for οἰνοφύλαξι. E. Sittig, in an unpublished inscription from Cyprus, Ζεὺς Ὁρομπάτας = Ζεὺς Ὀρευβάτης. C. Robert, *Der Autolykos des Leochares.* In *Plin. N. H.* 34. 18 the statue is not that of the Pancratiast but of Autolycus, the opponent of Timarchus.

Mnemosyne. XLIII. 1.

J. Van Binsbergen, *De Seruitute Praediorum Donationis causa constituenda.* Writers on Roman law unanimously assert, 'seruitutem rerum ex liberali causa constitui posse.' For this view, however, Van B. fails to find justification in Papinianus, from whom he merely gathers the probability 'donationis causa seruitutem tolli posse.' J. J. Hartmann continues his studies in Plutarch. He gives appreciations of the *De Curiositate* ('undoubtedly a lecture delivered in some Boeotian town other than Chaeronea'), *De Cupiditate Diuitiarum* ('spurious'), *De Vitioso Pudore* ('also a lecture'), *De Inuidia et Odio*, *De se Ipsum citra Inuidiam Laudando.* Notes are added on particular passages. C. P. Burger, jun., *Studia Horatiana.* A study of the Odes addressed to Maecenas, in which an attempt is made to refute the arguments of Peerlkamp. B. regards these odes as poetical epistles written in answer to epistles

from Maecenas to Horace, and interprets them from this standpoint. M. Valetón concludes his articles *De Compositione Iliadis*, in which he has maintained the theory of an original *Achilleis* enlarged by various subsequent poets into our *Iliad*. In the present article he deals with objections to this theory which he classifies under three heads: (1) From the *Iliad* the whole story of Troy is learnt, which shows that the poem is due to the design of a single writer. (2) The inconsistencies found in the *Iliad* can be explained without resort to the hypothesis of more than a single author. (3) The consistency of the characters and uniformity of the style indicate a single author. V. collects the evidence for the 'Pisistratean recension,' which he is inclined to accept, but maintains that the *Iliad* already existed in writing. He appends the portions of the *Iliad* which he regards as the 'original *Achilleis*.' This number contains also short notes on the Herculean 'Index Stoicorum,' on a Christian inscription found in Holland, on Sophocles *Indagatores*, and on the use of the boomerang among European nations.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. XVII. 8. 1914.

K. Holl, *Die Vorstellung vom Märtyrer und die Märtyrerakte in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. The first *acta martyrum*, those of Polycarp and Justin, belong to the latter part of the second century. The martyr was now first ranked higher than the prophet, and his vision of the supernatural world the best evidence of the Christian religion. The *acta* are partly in the form of letters, partly in that of a judicial process. In the Decian persecution the conception of the martyr as prophet disappeared; he became the glorious hero, and the letters disappeared. After Diocletian the martyrs find rivals in the miracle-working monks: then the martyrs also became workers of miracles. In the course of time the greatest stress came to be laid on the sufferings of the martyrs. E. Hoffmann, *Die Entwicklung des Weltproblems in der vorsokratischen Philosophie*. On the importance of the pre-Socratic philosophy for advanced pupils of the *Gymnasium*.

XVII. 9. 1914.

Fr. Poland, *Zur Charakteristik Menanders*. Menander uses very few names for his characters, but is skilful in introducing new shades of character. O. Weinreich, *Typisches und Individuelles in der Religiosität des Aelius Aristides*. As a pious dreamer who published his dreams Aelius was typical of his age, but he is original in raising such work to the standards of high literature. A. Schulten, *Birrenswark. Ein britannisches Numantia* (mit einer Tafel). The circumvallation probably to be ascribed to Julius Agricola. E. Samter, *Homerunterricht und Volkskunde*. Shows how folklore can be used in the teaching of Homer. W. Schink, *Cicero als Philosoph*. Remarks on the *De Finibus*, showing that Cicero's eclecticism was much more than a mere patchwork of Greek ideas.

Philologus. LXXIII. 2.

V. Coulon, *Textkritisches zu Aristophanes*. Discussion preliminary to an edition of Aristophanes. J. Baunack, *Hesychiana*. IV. Emendations and an index of lemmata discussed in these articles. C. Ritter, *Kleinigkeiten zu Thales, Herakleitos, Gorgias*. Critical and exegetical notes on Diels, *Doxographi*. H. Wegehaupt, *Planudes und Plutarch*. The Codex Ambrosianus C. 126 inf. is the original MS. of Planudes and the source of all other MSS. of the corpus. P. Lehmann, *Cassiodorstudien*. V. Gives the text of a compendium of the *Institutiones* hitherto unpublished, Vat. lat. 4955. It may be the work of Landulfus, a monk of Beneventum. W. Kroll, *Die Grabschrift der Allia Potestas*, and L. Gurlitt, *Die Allia-Inschrift*. Discussions of the inscription discovered in 1912 (*Atene e Roma*, 1913, p. 257). E. Müller-Graupe, *Mapalia*. The meaning is (i.) tents of leather, etc., (ii.) portable huts, (iii.) a group of such tents or huts, a village.

Rheinisches Museum. LXIX. 4.

J. M. Stahl, *Arion und Thespis*. Th. Birt, *Zu Sophokles*. A. Rosenberg, *Herodot und Cortona*. Discussion of Herodotus I. 57. Cortona is the commercial link between Etruria and Umbria, is between Caere and Spina on the Adriatic, the inlets of the oldest Greek trade. So the logographers saw in the inhabitants of Cortona a separate barbarian people in Central Italy, not Etruscan. Herodotus says they are Pelasgi from Thessaly. This was based on some logographer's play with names, e.g. Cortona is an echo of the Thessalian Gyrton. So the logographers say Thessalian = Pelasgian, Cortona from Thessaly, therefore Pelasgian from Thessaly. Herodotus' argument proceeds. (1) The inhabitants of Plakie on the Hellespont are Pelasgi (Hekataeus). (2) Cortona is a Pelasgic settlement. (3) The people of Plakie speak a barbarous tongue (his own knowledge). (4) The people of Croton are a separate barbarian people. Conclusion: The people of Cortona are emigrant Pelasgi, speaking old-Pelasgic. Thus Hdt. I. 57 is no real evidence for any identification of the Lemnians with the Etruscans. The speech of Lemnos may be related to Etruscan, but Herodotus is no evidence for it. F. Münzer, *Ein römischer Epikureer*. L. Saufeius was a friend of Atticus, who governed his life on Epicurean principles. From Serv. i. 6 on etymology of Latium from *latere*, we get a piece of Saufeius. This is Epicurean in tendency because it argues against the god Saturn's hiding as source of name, and substitutes the hiding of primitive man in caves, etc.; with verbal echoes of Lucretius v. 955 sqq. This may well then be a fragment of Epicurean literary propaganda by Saufeius. Cicero's relations with Saufeius are much the same as those with Lucretius. S. Tafel, *Die Vordere, bisher verloren geglaubte Hälfte des Vossianischen Ansonius-codex*. H. Kallenberg, *Studien über den griechischen Artikel*. III. A. Ludwig, *Die Quellenberichte über Aristarchs Ilias-Athetesen*. R. Philippson, *Die Abfassungszeit der Horazoden* III. 6 und III. 29. F. Novotny, *Ort und Ort in Platons Briefen*. O. Immisch, *Ad Aristoteles poet. c. 18*. N. A. Béys, *Die frühbyzantinische Grabinschrift eines Arztes*.

LXX. 1.

W. Heraeus, *Προπείν*. In Martial xii. 82. 11 the MS. reading *propin* is to be kept: so in Petron. 28. 3 read *propin esse* for *propinasse*: *propin* = *προπίν*, *προπείν* contracted aor. infin. from *προπίνω*: and is used as a noun to mean a drink taken before a meal. H. F. Miller, *Glosseme und Dittographien in den Enneaden des Plotinos*. G. Funaioli, *Scolii Filargiriani*. Description of seventy MSS. containing scholia by Philargyrius: history of these scholia down to modern times. J. Mesk, *Lukians Timon*. The satire is not based on a comedy, but on a story of Timon in biographical form: this Lucian has worked up, using his learning in comedy and Menippean satire. *Miszellen*: W. Schmid, *Zu Kallimachos Epigr. 28, and 52*. M. Wallies, *Zur doppelten Rezension des siebenten Buches der aristotelischen Physik*. W. Heraeus, *Priapeum*, XXXII. C. Weymann, *Zu lateinischen Schriftstellern*. A. Brinkmann, *Lückenbüsser*.

Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica. Vol. XLIII. No. 1. 1915.

F. Calonghi, *The Prologue of the Metamorphoses of Apuleius*. A minute examination of the first chapter of the *Metamorphoses*, distinguishing two speakers, the author and the hero Lucius. The theories of Rohde, Bürger, van der Vliet, and others are discussed. G. Giri, *The Invocation of Venus in Lucretius and her representation with Mars*. The substitution of Venus for the Muse in the opening invocation is a novelty. She is invoked not only as the vital principle in Nature and as patroness of Memmius, but as the giver of peace to Rome; hence her representation with Mars and the epithet 'Aeneadum genitrix.' H. Mancuso, *De similitudinibus Homericis capita selecta I*. Defends the ass-simile in *Il.* A 558-65 as one of many half-humorous similes

in the Epic. The lion-simile (A 548-57) is borrowed from P 657-67. A. Olivetti, *The Massacres at Constantinople after the Death of Constantine the Great*. An attempt to acquit Constantius of responsibility for the Flavian massacre of A.D. 337. R. Sabbadini, *Parthenius and the Moretum again*. The statement that the *Moretum* is an imitation of a Greek original by Parthenius (*Rivista* 31. 472) is due to a misunderstanding of the name Parthenias ascribed to Virgil by Servius. L. Dalmasso, *The Chronological problem of Palladius and Rutilius Namatianus*. Identifies the writer on agriculture with the Palladius of Rutilius I. 205-16, and adduces passages from his work which show special knowledge of Gaul, e.g. the reaping-machine of VII. 2, 2-4. E. Bignone, *Lucretius* I. 724, proposes 'ciat ignis' for the corrupt 'omniat ignis.' F. Stabile, *De Codice Cavensi Vitae Alexandri Magni*, II. The Codex Cavensis contains various statements wanting in Bambergensis but found in the J. 1. MSS., to which it should therefore be referred. The Cod. Neapolitanus is derived from the same exemplum. F. Stabile, *The Date of the Author of the De Viris Illustribus*. Assigns the treatise to the third century at the earliest, and controverts Pichlmayr's view that Ampelius is one of its sources. C. Lanzani, *De littera E in fronte templi Delphici insculpta*. The letter being inscribed 'in fronte templi' should be the initial letter of the god's name, i.e. Helios.

Wiener Studien. XXXV. 1, 2.

J. Mesk, *Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal*. II. Lucian used Juv. III. Date of *Nigrinus* c. 155-165 A.D. H. Lackenbacher, *Beiträge zur antiken Optik*. W. F. Otto, *Römische Sagen*. III. *Larentia u. Acca Larentia*: Larentia: Lares; Larentinia = mater Larum; Acca Larentia associated with the Lupercalia. H. Schörl, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Varros Büchern von der Landwirtschaft*. F. Blumenthal, *Die Autobiographie des Augustus*. I. R. Novák, *Kritische Studien zu Seneca Rhetor*. II. W. A. Baehrens, *Zu Florus*. II. A. Goldbacher, *Die Reste einer Hs. des VI. Jahrh. in Paris und Genf, und die Cambridger Hs. Add. 3479*. The Cambridge MS. of Augustine is a parallel to the two fragments. S. Brassloff, *Zur Frage der Heimat des Juristen Gaius*. The position given to the discussion of vine and olive culture points to Rome. R. Mollweide, *Die Entstehung der Cicero-Excerpta des Hadoard und ihre Bedeutung für die Textkritik*. Excerpta are to be traced to 'Westfranken.' J. Mesk, *Die Composition des plautinischen Miles*. Contaminated from two plays of Menander. W. Soltau, *Die sogenannte Latinerbündniss des Spurius Cassius*. Agrees with Hartmann as to date (358 B.C.). F. Blumenthal, *Die Autobiographie des Augustus*. II. R. Novák, *Kritische Studien zu Seneca Rhetor*. III. E. Groag, *Platos Lehre von den Seelentheilen*. Falls into three periods: (1) Unity and indivisibility of the soul (early writings including *Phaedo*); (2a) The parts of the soul (*Phaedrus*, *Republic* I.); (2b) The partial souls (*Timaeus*, *Politicus*, *Laws*). E. Hauler, *Die alte Papyrushandschrift zu Augustinus und der Cantabrig. Add. 3479*. II. *Miszellen*. H. Jurenka, *Zu Pindars sechsten Pään*, V. 54, ἰσθ' ὄρι, Μοῖραι. J. Pavlu, *Zu Sall. bell. Jug. 49, 4f. conspiciatur* is to be taken as active.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1914.

Aug. 10. Jules Martha, *La langue étrusque* (C. Wessely). 'Deserves thorough study.' C. Turet, *Dominance et résistance dans la phonétique latine* (Walde). Contains new general points of view, and also many acute observations.

Aug. 17 (double number). L. Mader, *Beiträge zur epischen Technik der Ilias* (Draheim). R. Schütz, *Ciceros historische Kenntnisse* (O. Leuze). A useful compilation. I. Scheftelowitz, *Das Schlingen- und Netzmotiv im Glauben und Brauch der Völker* (Pfister). 'Valuable material.'

Aug. 31. A. C. Clark, *The primitive text of the Gospels and Acts* (Larfeld).

Sept. 7. A. Heisenberg and L. Wenger, *Byzantinische Papyri zu München* (Wessely). Pauly, *Realencyclopädie der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. W. Kroll. Suppl. II. (F. Harder). Jacoby's article on Herodotus is of great importance. M. Wundt, *Platons Leben und Werk* (Gillischewski). A clear presentation of the chief Platonic problems in admirable style.

Sept. 14. A. Diès, *La transposition platonicienne* (Gillischewski). 'Stimulating.'

Sept. 21. L. Wohleb, *Die lateinische Übersetzung der Didache* (Stangl).

Sept. 28. J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre, le philosophe néo-platonicien* (Scholz). Will be the foundation of all future study of Porphyrios.

Oct. 5. G. Leroux, *Les origines de l'édifice hypostyle* (Fiechter). W. Schonack *Ein Jahrhundert Berliner philologischer Dissertationen. 1810-1910* (Nohl). Would have borne compression.

Oct. 12. F. Luckhardt, *Das Privathaus im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten* (Th. Reil). 'Successful.'

Oct. 19. K. Borinski, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie* (Rosenthal). A work on the grand scale.

Nov. 2. H. Maier, *Sokrates, sein Werk und seine geschichtliche Stellung* (H. Nohl). The details are more valuable than the general picture. Susan H. Ballou, *The manuscript tradition of the Historia Augusta* (Stangl).

Nov. 9. Brunn-Bruckmann, *Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Skulptur*, continued by P. Arndt. 127-133. W. Amelung makes detailed criticisms. J. A. K. Thomson, *Studies in the Odyssey* (Stürmer).

Nov. 16. A. Schmekel, *Die positive philosophie. II. Isidorus von Sevilla* (Philipp). The author is not acquainted with the latest literature. F. Stürmer, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung*. A defence of the view of Rothe against Finsler's criticism (DLZ. Aug. 8).

Nov. 23. Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung* (Helbing). 'Valuable.' †F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur. I. Die archaische Literatur* (Friedrich). A storehouse of observations, always acute and often profound.

Nov. 30. H. Draheim, *Die Ilias als Kunstwerk* (Stürmer). L. Robin, *La théorie platonicienne des idées et des nombres d'après Aristote* (Lehnert). Valuable results, encouraging further study.

Dec. 7. W. Schmid, *W. von Christs Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. II. 2. From 100-530 A.D.* (R. Wagner). A monumental undertaking. R. Herbertz, *Das Wahrheitsproblem in der griechischen Philosophie* (Nestle). E. Fränkel, *Geschichte der griech. Nomina agentis auf -τής, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*. II. (Helbing). Sound and thorough.

Dec. 14. F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Walde).

Dec. 28. E. Bethe, *Homer, Dichtung und Sage. I. Ilias* (Stürmer). The results are quite new, but open to criticism.

1915. Jan. 4. J. Ponten, *Griechische Landschaften, ein Versuch künstlerischen Erdbeschreibens* (Martens). Praised. O. Koennecke, *Bucolici Graeci*, rec. O. K. (Sitzler). W. W. Jäger, *Nemesios von Emesa* (Berndt). Important.

Jan. 11. A. Krieger, *De Aululariae Plautinae exemplari Graeco* (Sonnenburg).

Jan. 18. H. Schneider, *Der kretische Ursprung des phönikischen Alphabets*, etc. (Goessler). H. Dittmar, *Aischines von Sphettos* (Mutschmann).

Jan. 25. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides* (J. Sitzler). A storehouse of instruction.

Feb. 1. A. M. Alexanderson, *Den grekiska trieren* (Chr. Harder). G. Kanopka, *De Aenea postvergiliano* (Harder).

Feb. 8. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis . . . Justinian*. IV. 1. *Die römische Litteratur des vierten Jahrhunderts*. 2 ed. (Harder). The new edition contains valuable additions. J. Medert, *Quaestiones criticae et grammaticae ad Gynaecia Mustionis pertinentes* (R. Fuchs).

Feb. 15. C. Katluhn, *Γέρας* (W. Gemoll). Homer should have been more fully considered. *Festgabe für Martin Schanz*, überreicht von ehemaligen Schülern (Helbing). G. Ferrero, *Grösse und Niedergang Roms*. I. (Ziehen). Has great excellencies and also serious defects.

Feb. 22. A. T. Clay, *Babylonian records* (Delitzsch). Thoroughly reliable. W. W. Fowler, *Roman ideas of deity* (Dibelius).

Mar. 1. A. Trendelenburg, *Pausanias in Olympia* (Lamer). Clear and readable. J. Formigé, *Remarques diverses sur les théâtres romains à propos de celles d'Arles et d'Orange* (Fabia). Interesting and valuable comments.

Mar. 8. M. Wellmann, *Die Schrift des Dioskurides περί ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων* (Schonack). Praised. T. S. Duncan, *The influence of art on description in the poetry of P. Papinius Statius* (F. Harder). Well thought out. Th. Stangl, *Cassiodoriana*.

LANGUAGE.

Glotta. VI. Band, 2 Heft.

Th. Stein, *On the accident of the Inscriptions from Priene*. P. Wahrmann, σφέλας, σφάλλω; σφέλας = 'cudgel' 'bench'; σφάλλω meant originally 'to throw a man by means of a cudgel,' then 'to hinder.' Joh. Compennass, *Vulgaria*; *nedum* = *non solum*; *suppedium* = *refugium*; *plus*, *amplius* = *potius*; *nisi quia* = *nisi*; *effugare*; *curare*, *facere*, *iubere* 'to cause, let' with the infinitive. J. H. Schmalz, Linguistic notes on the *Opus Agriculturae* of Palladius.

VI. Band, 3 Heft.

O. Immisch, Φάλλαβα, 'seelenschmetterling.' Also called *περομένη ψυχή*, originally 'a winged φαλλός'; the writer traces the development of this crude conception and its final application to the symbolism of the human body and soul. A. Musić, *On the use of the Prohibitive Subjunctive for the Prohibitive Imperative in Greek*. Seeks to explain why μή is used with the 2 pers. of the present imperative, but rarely with that of the aorist imperative, the aorist subjunctive taking its place. J. Samuelsson, *The Latin verbs in -iläre (-iläre)*. Investigation of their classification and the double form -ul- -il-. The writer fails to detect any underlying principle. He hardly thinks it likely that there was an original suffix -ilo-, although it is generally admitted that the passive verbal adjectives in -ilis passed into the third declension after first belonging to the second with suffix -ulus. *Ambulo* is a diminutive of *ambio*, *exulo* of *exeo*. P. Wahrmann, *Caccitus* (Petron. *Cena* 63) is the Greek κατάκοιτος used in the sense of παιδικά.

Indogermanische Forschungen. XXXIII. 5. 1914.

E. W. Fay, *Word-Studies*. 1. Gr. (-ε)νεκεσ- 'bond,' 'binding.' In *ποδηνεκές*, *διηνεκές*. 3. Lat. *iuxta* 'near.' *iuxta(s)* nom. sing. m. of the type *ad-uersus* = *in ingo stans*. Excursus on Lat. *artus*. 7. Lat. *territorium*; stems *teres-*, *ters-* (*terr-*). 8. Lat. *perendinus* from *per* **semem diem* 'over a day.' 9. On Cyprian *ΔιΦει-θεμς*. *ΔιΦει* is locative, as in *διπτερής* 'heavenpointing,' *εὐ-διδει-νός*. N. van Wijk, *The Indogermanic word for 'ant.'* R. Günther, *Greek Miscellanies*. 1. *The Origin of the Aeolic Optative*. The dissimilation of *aia* to *eia* can be traced from century to century. An aorist *γράφαια*, *γράφαις* (on the model of a present *γράφω*, *γράφωις*) would become *γράφεια*, *γράφαις*; by symmetry *γράφαιαν* would be formed on the one hand, and *γράφεις* etc. on the other. 2. *Gortynian τρίνς*. By lengthening from *τρέες*. E. Hermann, *Late Laconian again*. Reviews.

XXXIV. 1. 2.

W. Schwering, *Deus and divus*. *Divus* in old Latin is always a noun, an adjective first in Porphyrius Optatianus, in the time of Constantine the Great; *deus* has very early the meaning of an abstract divine power. In the republican period *divus* was little used, though favoured by the poets as an archaism; under the principate it came into vogue in connexion with the new cult of the emperor.

XXXIV. 3. 4.

H. Collitz, *Notes on the Weak Preterite*. v. d. Osten-Sacken, *On Hirt's Explanation of the Indogermanic-es Stems*. W. Pedersen, *The Origin of the Exocentrica*. Hermann, *On the Apocope of Prepositions in Greek*, shews that the shortened forms do not always originate in the same way; ὄν, ἀνά; πᾶρ, παρά; πέρ, περῖ may be genuine old doublets. In other cases the short form came into use before a vowel, and was subsequently employed before consonants as well.

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. XLVI. 3, 4.

A. Brückner, *Miszellen*: 1. *Zur Geschichte der Buchenbenennung*. The absence in Slavonic of a special name for the red beech does not justify any conclusions as to the original home of the Slavonic languages. 2. Lat. *ilia* 'groin, bowels' is to be connected with Gk. ἰλὺς, Slav. *jalito*, *olito*. 3. The change of initial *j* to *l*: dial. *lelito* from *jelito*, *leno* from *jeno*, etc. 4. Change of *dl(tl)* to *gl(kl)*: Pol. *jegla* from *jedla*, etc. Suffix *-tro-* remains as in *utro-*. 5. Abusive names based on place-names. Pol. *zberedzić* 'steal' from the district *Pobereze*. A. Brückner, *Die litauische Spracheinheit*. Eduard Hermann, *Die epische Zerdehnung*. A new explanation of ὀπώνυρες, etc. J. Wackernagel, *Indoiranica*. W. Caland, *Zu mulier quae mulier*. J. Pokorny, *Beiträge zur irischen Grammatik; Herkunft u. Etymologie des Wortes Eisen*. F. Bechtel, *Parerga*: 50. Ἀδελφίνοι. 51. Δίτυλος. T. Kehrhahn, *Zum lesbischen Dialekt*. Hans Reichelt, *Studien zur lateinischen Laut- u. Wortgeschichte*. I. *Vorarbeiten zu einer Darstellung des Ablauts in Wurzelsilben*. The necessity of investigation of the ablaut-relations of the vowel *a*, based on a revision of the material. Examination of a number of word-groups. Josef Bruch, *Zwei ligurische Wörter im Lateinisch-Romanischen*. I. Fr. *lapin* and Lat. *lepus*. II. The H.Germ. *spiauter*. F. Bechtel, *Parerga*. 52. *φαίω*; 53. Les. *ποι*; 54. *Στήρις*. Jos. Schrijnen, *Das sabinische l im Lateinischen*. The change of *d* to *l* due to Sabine influence only in case of names of borrowed things and institutions, e.g. *Capitolium*, *consules*, *seliquastrum*, *solium*. Cases of the change due to purely phonetic causes difficult to establish. *Lacrima*, *lautia*, *laevir*, *lingua* are discussed at length.

, an
deus
period
the

uation
mann,
ways
plets,
ently

ce in
as to
to be
lelito
, etc.
Pol.
nheit.
etc.
orny,
chtel,
Hans
Dar-
laut-
of a
schen.
verga.
schen.
owed
f the
aevir,